



15 1871

From the Library of
Rev. Allen Henry Brown, D. D.
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

PL 115 .A63 1839 v.2

Lehmann, Johann Lorenz,
1746-1755.

Institutes of ecclesiastical
history, ancient and

505
7.2 038

11

Allen H. Brown.

Jan 1844—



LIBRARY
* DEC 15 191
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANCIENT AND MODERN,
IN FOUR BOOKS,

MUCH CORRECTED, ENLARGED, AND IMPROVED FROM THE
PRIMARY AUTHORITIES.

✓
BY JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D.,

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN.

A NEW AND LITERAL TRANSLATION, FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH
COPIOUS ADDITIONAL NOTES, ORIGINAL AND SELECTED.

BY JAMES MURDOCK, D.D.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

NEW-YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, 82 CLIFF-STREET.

1839.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1839, by JAMES MURDOCK,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Connecticut District.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

To produce a general history of the Christian church, adapted especially to the wants of the younger clergy, but suitable for intelligent readers of all classes, a history so comprehensive as to touch on all the more important facts, briefly indeed, but distinctly, with suitable enlargement on the points of peculiar interest, and a constant reference to authorities and to the writers who give more full information, so that the work, while itself affording a good general knowledge of the whole subject, might serve as a guide to more thorough investigations;—such was the design of Dr. *Mosheim* in the following work, and such has been the aim of the present translator.

The great need of such a work at the present day, when every other branch of theology is much cultivated, is so generally felt, that it is unnecessary to say anything to evince its importance or to excite an interest on the subject. The only things, therefore, which here claim attention, are the character and history of Dr. *Mosheim*, the reasons for giving a new translation of his work, and the additions made to it by way of notes.

John Lawrence von Mosheim was nobly born at Lubec, October 9, 1694. His education was completed at the university of Kiel, where, at an early age, he became professor of philosophy. In his youth he cultivated a taste for poetry; and he actually published criticisms on that subject. But pulpit eloquence, biblical and historical theology, and practical religion, were his favourite pursuits. He published seven volumes of sermons, and left a valuable treatise on preaching, which was printed after his death. The English and French preachers, particularly Tillotson and Watts, Saurin, Massillon, and Flechier, were his models. The Germans admit that he contributed much to improve the style and manner of preaching in their country. While a professor at Kiel, he gained such reputation that the King of Denmark invited him to a professorship at Copenhagen. But the Duke of Brunswick soon after, in the year 1725, called him to the divinity chair at Helmstadt, which he filled with great applause for twenty-two years. In 1747, when George II. king of England, the founder of the university of Gottingen, wished to place over that institution men of the highest rank in the literary world, Dr. *Mosheim* was deemed worthy to be its chancellor, and the head of the department of theology. In this honourable station he remained eight years, or till his death, September 9, 1755. His works were very numerous; consisting of translations into Latin or German of various foreign works, Italian, French, Eng-

lish, and Greek, with learned notes; an immense number of disquisitions relating to historical, dogmatic, and moral subjects; besides orations, sermons, letters, &c. On church history, in which he most distinguished himself, he published, among other works, two volumes of essays on detached subjects; and a compendious church history, in two volumes, 12mo; a full church history of the first century, 4to; Commentary on the affairs of Christians till the times of Constantine, 4to; and he had just published the revision and enlargement of his compendious church history, under the new title of *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, ancient and modern, in one volume, 4to, when he was removed by death, at the age of 61.

The character of Dr. Mosheim is thus given by his disciple and translator, *J. R. Schlegel*. "We may have had, perhaps, biblical interpreters, who, like Ernesti and Michaelis, expounded the Scriptures with more philosophical and critical learning; perhaps, also, theologians and moralists who have treated dogmatic and practical theology with more metaphysical præcision; we may likewise have had, and perhaps still have, pulpit orators, who, among the many unsuccessful imitators of Mosheim's method, have even rivalled him, and perhaps come nearer to that ideal perfection which he wished to see realized. But in ecclesiastical history, the merits of Mosheim are so decisive and peculiar, that I will not venture to compare him with any who preceded or followed him in this department of learning. He is, as Schroeckh says, our first real *historian* in church history."* Dr. *Maclaine* informs us that, after he had commenced his translation, he received a letter from Bishop Warburton, saying, "*Mosheim's compendium is excellent, the method admirable; in short, the only one deserving the name of an ecclesiastical history. It deserves and needs frequent notes.*"

Mosheim's *Institutes*, as well as most of his other historical works, being written in Latin, were accessible to learned foreigners. And Dr. *Archibald Maclaine*, the son of a dissenting minister in the north of Ireland, and himself an assistant minister to an English congregation at the Hague, published an English translation of these *Institutes* so early as the year 1764, only nine years after the appearance of the original. Dutch and French translations were also made; but I know not by whom or at what time. In 1769, *J. A. C. von Einem*, a pious but not profound German minister, commenced his German translation of the *Institutes*. His design was to bring down the work to the capacities of the unlearned, and to render it an edifying book for common Christians. Accordingly, he omitted nearly all the marginal references and discussions, and introduced much religious biography and historical detail. His translation fills six vols. 8vo, and the continuation of the history three additional volumes. In the year 1770, *John R. Schlegel*, rector of the gymnasium of Heilbronn, a learned and judicious man, commenced another German translation, which is very literal and close, free from all interpolations, and ac-

* Schlegel's Mosheim, vol. i., Preface.

compained with learned notes. This translation, in four large volumes 8vo, was completed in 1780; and a continuation of the history, in two volumes, appeared in 1784 and 1788.

The lectures and the printed works of Mosheim on ecclesiastical history kindled up such ardour for this science in Germany, that, in the course of fifty years, *Baumgarten*, *Semler*, *Schroeckh*, *Henke*, and *Schmidt*, severally, produced large and valuable church histories. Of these, the most full and complete is that of *Schroeckh*, a pupil of Mosheim, continued by Tzschirner, in forty-five vols. 8vo. And next, that of *Henke*, continued by Vater, in nine vols. 8vo. Nor has the ardour for this branch of theology yet subsided in Germany; for Professor *Neander*, of Berlin, is now publishing a profound and philosophical church history, which, if completed on the plan commenced, will probably fill twenty-five or thirty volumes 8vo. The limits assigned to this preface will not allow a discussion of the merits of these several successors of Mosheim. Suffice it to say, that a careful examination of them all has resulted in the decided conviction that Mosheim's history, in a form similar to that given to it by Schlegel, is the best adapted to the wants of this country, and the most likely to meet general approbation among the American clergy.

The necessity for a new English version of the *Institutes* arises principally from the unauthorized liberties taken by the former translator, under the mistaken idea of improving the work and rendering it more acceptable to the public. He says in his preface: "*The style of the original is by no means a model to imitate in a work designed for general use. Dr. Mosheim affected brevity, and laboured to crowd many things into few words: thus his diction, though pure and correct, became sententious and harsh, without that harmony which pleases the ear, and those transitions which make a narration flow with ease. This being the case, I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author, and followed the spirit of his narrative without adhering strictly to the letter: and have often added a few sentences to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finished.*" Thus Dr. Maclaine frankly owns, that his chief design was to render the work interesting to those superficial readers who delight in that harmony which pleases the ear, and in those transitions which make a narration flow with ease; and that he often added a few sentences of his own, to give more vivacity and point to the sentiments of his author, or more splendour to their dress. And whoever will be at the pains of comparing his translation with the original, may see that he has essentially changed the *style*, and greatly coloured and altered in many places the *sentiments* of his author; in short, that he has *paraphrased* rather than *translated* a large part of the work. The book is thus rendered heavy and tedious to the reader by its superfluity of words, and likewise obscure and indefinite, and sometimes self-contradictory, by the looseness of its unguarded statements. Its credibility also as a history of facts is impaired, and it fails of carrying full conviction to the mind, because

it is stripped of its native simplicity, precision, and candour. For no wise man will confide in a writer who appears intent on fabricating sonorous and flowing periods, who multiplies splendid epithets, and habitually deals in loose and unqualified assertions. Nor is this all, for the old translation has actually exposed Dr. Mosheim to severe and unmerited censure from different quarters: and Dr. *Maclaine* has long stood accused before the public as a translator "who has interwoven his own sentiments in such a manner with those of the original author, both in the notes and in the text, that it is impossible for a mere English reader to distinguish them; and in diverse instances he has entirely contradicted him. This (add the accusers) will be evident to all, if a literal translation of Mosheim shall ever be published."* It is not strange, therefore, that so large a portion of the community have been dissatisfied with Dr. *Maclaine's* Mosheim, and have desired a more faithful and literal version of this valuable author.

If the translation here offered to the public, is what it was intended to be, it is a close, literal version, containing neither more nor less than the original, and presenting the exact thoughts of the author in the same direct, artless, and lucid manner, with as much similarity in the phraseology and modes of expression as the idioms of the two languages would admit. That all the elegances of the Latin style and diction of the author have been retained, is not pretended. The translator can only say he has aimed to give Mosheim, as far as he was able, the same port and mien in English as he has in Latin.

But writing out an entirely new and independent translation of the *Institutes* has not been half the labour bestowed on the work. Everywhere the statements of Mosheim have been compared with the sources from which they were drawn, and with the representations of other standard writers of different communities, so far as the means of doing this were at hand. The reasonings also of Mosheim have been weighed with care. And nothing has been suffered to go before the public, without first passing an examination by the best criteria within the reach of the translator. Often days and weeks have been consumed in such examinations, when the results were, that Mosheim's statements needed no correction, or at least that no palpable errors were discovered in them, and it was therefore thought advisable to allow him to express his own views without note or comment. But, in many instances, the translator supposed that he discovered such mistakes or defects in his author as called for animadversion. In these cases he has given, in the form of notes, such statements and criticisms as he deemed necessary. Numerous other instances occurred in which Mosheim was found to differ from other standard writers, or to have simply omitted what the translator or others deemed worth inserting; and in such cases the opinions or statements of other writers have been given, that the reader might be able to compare them, and the omitted matter has been supplied. In the history of the *primitive church*, for two or three centuries, the translator deemed almost every-

* See the New-York edition of *Maclaine's Mosheim*, in 1824, vol. iv., p. 284.

thing interesting which can be learned with any degree of certainty. Accordingly, his notes and animadversions here are more frequent and minute than in the subsequent parts of the work.—In regard to what are called the *fathers*, especially those of the four first centuries, and likewise the *leading men* in the church in all ages, he has deemed it proper greatly to enlarge the account given by Mosheim; not so much by minutely tracing the history of their private lives, as by more fully stating their *public* characters and acts, and mentioning such of their works as have come down to us. In no one respect has the history been more enlarged than in this. Through all the ages down to the reformation, the eminent men, whom Mosheim thought proper to name particularly, have each a distinct note assigned them, containing all of much importance which can be said of them; and in each century, at the close of Mosheim's list of eminent men, nearly a complete catalogue of all those omitted by him is subjoined, with brief notices of the most material things known concerning them.—On the controversies and disputes among Christians, especially such as related to religious *doctrines*, much and critical attention has been bestowed. So also the reputed *heresies*, and the different *sects* of professed Christians, which Mosheim had treated with great fulness and ability, have been carefully re-examined and subjected to critical remarks. Here great use has been made of the writers who succeeded Mosheim, and particularly of the younger *Walch*.—The propagation of Christianity, especially among the nations of Europe in the middle ages, and among the Asiatics by the Nestorians, has been the subject of frequent and sometimes long notes.—The origin and history of the *reformation*, particularly in countries not of the Augsburg confession; also the contests between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and the history of the English and Scotch churches, and of the English dissenters, have received particular attention; and the occasional mistakes of Mosheim have been carefully pointed out. Yet the enlargements of the history since the times of Luther, and particularly during the seventeenth century, have been the less considerable, because there was danger of swelling the third volume to a disproportionate size, and because another opportunity is anticipated for supplying these omissions.

These remarks may give some idea of the extensive additions to the original by way of notes. All additions to the work are carefully distinguished from the original by being enclosed in brackets. They are also accompanied by a notice of the persons responsible for their truth and correctness. What the translator gives as his own, he subscribes with a *Tr*. When he borrows from others, which he has done very largely, he either explicitly states what is borrowed, and from whom, or subjoins the name of the author. Thus several notes are borrowed directly from *Maclaine*; and these are not only marked as quotations, but they have the signature *Macl.* annexed. A few others are translated from *Von Einem's* Mosheim; and these have the signature *Von Ein.* affixed. But the learned and judicious *Schlegel* has been

taxed for the greatest amount of contributions. Throughout the work his notes occur, translated from the German, and with the signature *Schl.* annexed.

The work is now divided, perhaps for the first time, into *three* volumes of nearly equal size, each embracing a grand and distinct period of church history, strongly marked with its own peculiar characteristics ; and, being furnished with a separate index, each volume is a complete and independent work of itself.

A continuation of the history to the present time is deemed so important, that the translator intends, if his life and health are spared, to attempt a compilation of this sort as soon as the printing of these volumes shall be completed.

New-Haven, February 22, 1832.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE first edition of this work, consisting of fifteen hundred copies, was published by A. H. Maltby, a worthy bookseller of New-Haven, towards the close of the year 1832. At the same time, two stereotype editions of Dr. Maclaine's Mosheim were thrown before the public, at very reduced prices; and no pains were spared by the interested booksellers to give them currency. But notwithstanding this strenuous competition, and the supervening commercial embarrassments of the country, with no special efforts to give it circulation, and no patronage but what was voluntarily afforded by the friends of theological science and by a discerning and candid public, the new Mosheim had a regular and constant sale, at its original price, till the whole edition was exhausted; and the work is now received with favour in all parts of the country, and is adopted as a text-book in nearly every Protestant theological seminary on this side the Atlantic.

For this very kind reception of his work, the author feels himself under great obligations to the enlightened public who have passed so favourable a judgment upon it: and he would now offer them the best return he can make, a new edition of the work, carefully revised, and somewhat enlarged, and, as he hopes, more worthy of approbation, and better suited to the wants of students in this branch of theology.

The translation has been again compared with the original, throughout, sentence by sentence, and subjected to a rigid criticism. In a very few instances, it was discovered, that a word or clause of the original had been overlooked in the translation; and that in several instances, the import of the original had been inadequately or obscurely expressed. Yet no very important departure from the sense of the original author, has been discovered. Nearly all the numerous alterations and changes, therefore, relate to the phraseology, or to the choice of words and the structure of the sentences. The difficulty of combining a neat and perspicuous anglicism with a close adherence to the sense and to the very form of thought in the original, throughout so large a work, must be obvious to all who have had experience in the business of translating; and they will not need to be told, that numberless corrections and improvements will always occur to a translator, who revises his work after a lapse of several years. In this manner, the diction and the style of this edition, it is believed, have been considerably improved, without any sacrifice of fidelity in

the translation. If it be not so, more than half a year's labour has been expended unsuccessfully.

The references, to a considerable extent, and where the means were at hand, have been verified; and a considerable number of errors, some occasioned by the transcription, but more by the mistakes of the printers, have been corrected. Many new references to authorities and to modern authors, have also been added, in various parts of the work; and these, it is hoped, will add considerably to the value of the present edition.

Several topics have likewise been subjected to further investigation: and some new notes, of no inconsiderable length, have been added, especially in the first vol. of the work. See, for example, the notes on the Meletian controversy, p. 269, &c.;—on the origin of the Christian festivals, and particularly that of Christmas, p. 279, &c.;—on the life and labours of St. Patrick, the apostle of Ireland, p. 316, &c.;—and on the character and life of Mohammed, the progress of his religion, and the sects among his followers; both in the text and in the notes, p. 427-434.

The new matter in this edition amounts, probably, to fifteen or twenty pages in the three volumes. At the same time, by enlarging the pages a little, by greater economy in regard to blank spaces, and by giving the text in a type a trifle smaller, the number of pages in each of the volumes is less than in the former edition. The notes are also printed in double columns, which is not only favourable to economy in the printing, but will render the perusal of the longer notes less laborious to the eye.

Lastly, the exclusive publication of the work during ten years, having been assigned to one of the most distinguished publishing houses in America, and that house having undertaken to stereotype the work; great pains have been taken, both by the publishers and the author, to secure more accuracy in the printing of this edition, than was attained in the former edition.

New-Haven, 1839.

THE

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

My *Institutes of Christian History*(1) having been long out of print, the worthy person at whose expense they were published has often requested me to give a new edition of them, somewhat improved and enlarged. This request I for many years resisted; for I was reluctant to suspend other works then on my hands, which were deemed more important; besides, I must acknowledge that I shrunk from the irksome task of correcting and enlarging a book which needed so much amendment. The importunities of the publisher, however, and of other friends who joined with him, at length overcame my tardiness; and now, after the leisure hours of two years have been spent on the work, it is brought to a close; and these *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* now make their appearance, not only in a new form and dress, but so materially changed as to be almost entirely a new work.

The distribution of the materials under certain heads, which I once deemed the best form for the learner, is still retained; for, notwithstanding weighty reasons have occurred to my mind for preferring a continuous and unbroken narration, I have chosen to follow the judgment of those excellent men whom experience has led to prefer the former method. And, indeed, a little reflection must convince us, that whoever would embrace in a single book all the facts and observations necessary to a full acquaintance with the state of the church in every age of it, must, of course, adopt some classification and distribution of those facts; and as such was the design of the following work, I have left its primitive form unchanged, and have directed my attention solely to the correction, improvement, and enlargement of the work, so as to render it a more useful book.

My principal care has been to impart fidelity and authority to the narration. For this purpose I have gone to the primary sources of information, such as the best writers of all ages who lived in or near the times they describe; and I have consulted them with attention, and have transcribed from them, whenever they were sufficiently concise, and, at the same time, clear and nervous. It is often the case, that those who write summaries of history only abridge the more voluminous historians; and this method I myself before pursued to a considerable degree. But such a procedure, though sometimes

(1) [A work in 2 vols. 12mo, first published in 1737-41; and afterward abridged by J. P. Müller, in 1 vol. 12mo. Hamb., 1752.—Tr.]

justifiable and not to be wholly condemned, is attended with this evil, that it perpetuates the mistakes which are apt to abound in very large and voluminous works, by causing them to pass from a single book into numerous others. I had long been apprized of this danger; but I felt it, with no little mortification, when I brought the testimony of the best authorities to pour their light on the pages of my own work. I now perceived, that writers pre-eminent for their diligence and fidelity are not always to be trusted; and I found, that I had abundant occasion for adding, expunging, changing, and correcting in every part of my book. In performing this task, I know that I have not been wanting in patience and industry, or in watchfulness and care; but whether these have secured me against all mistakes, which is confessedly of no easy accomplishment, I leave *them* to judge who are best informed in ecclesiastical affairs. To aid persons disposed to institute such inquiries, I have, in general, made distinct reference to my authorities; and if I have perverted their testimony, either by misstatement or misapplication, I confess myself to be less excusable than other transgressors in this way, because I had before me all the authors whom I quote, and I turned them over, and read, and compared them with each other, being resolved to follow solely their guidance.

This effort to render my history faithful and true, that is, exactly coincident with the statements of the most credible witnesses, has caused many and various changes and additions throughout the work; but in no part of it are the alterations greater or more noticeable than in the *Third Book*, which contains the history of the church, and especially of the Latin or Western Church, from the time of Charlemagne to the reformation by Luther. This period of ecclesiastical history, though it embraces great events, and is very important on account of the light it casts on the origin and causes of the present civil and religious state of Europe, thereby enabling us correctly to estimate and judge of many things that occur in our own times, has not hitherto been treated with the same clearness, solidity, and elegance, as the other parts of church history. Here the number of original writers is great; yet few of them are in common use, or of easy acquisition, and they all frighten us either with their bulk, the barbarity of their style, or their excessive price; not a few of them, too, either knowingly or ignorantly, corrupt the truth, or at least obscure it by their ignorance and unskilfulness; and some of them have not yet been published. It is not strange, therefore, that many things in this part of ecclesiastical history should have been either silently passed over or less happily stated and explained, even by the most laborious and learned authors. Among these, the ecclesiastical annalists and the historians of the monastic sects, so famous in the Roman church, as *Baronius*, *Raynald*, *Bzovius*, *Manriquez*, *Wadding*, and others, though richly supplied with ancient manuscripts and records, have often committed more faults and fallen into greater mistakes, than writers far inferior to them in learning, reputation, and means of information. Having therefore bestowed much attention during many

years on the history of the church from the eighth century onward, and believing that I had obtained, from works published or still in manuscript, a better and more correct knowledge of many events than is given in the common accounts of those times, I conceived that I might do service to the cause of ecclesiastical history by exhibiting to the world some of the results of my investigations; and that, by throwing some light on the obscure period of the Middle Ages, I might excite men of talents and industry to pursue the same object, and thus to perfect the history of the Latin Church. I persuade myself that I have brought forward some things which are new, or before little known; that other things, which had been stated incorrectly or obscurely, I have here exhibited with clearness, and traced back to the proper authorities; and, claiming the indulgence allowed an old man to boast a little, that some things, which were accredited fables, I have now exploded. Whether I deceive myself in all this, or not, the discerning reader may ascertain by examining, and comparing with the common accounts, what I have here said respecting Constantine's donation, the Cathari and Albigenses, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit (that pest to many parts of Europe during four centuries), and of the Fratricelli [or Little Brethren], the controversies between the Franciscans and the Roman pontiffs, the history of Berengarius and of the Lollards, and several other subjects.

If, in these enlargements of ecclesiastical history, and while giving views either partially or wholly new, I had used the same brevity as on the subjects well stated and explained by many before me, I should neither have satisfied the inquisitive reader nor have done justice to myself. For I should have appeared to many, as a writer of fables; and *their apprehensions* on these subjects would have been indistinct, useless, and fallacious. Therefore, when I have departed widely from the common statements, or advanced apparent novelties, I have not only aimed to be very explicit, but, in order to give credibility to my narration, have gone into more ample disquisitions and citations of authorities, because full statements and demonstrations, though out of place in an epitome of history, were here indispensable.

In addition to these causes for changing materially the character, and swelling the size, of my book, another occurred soon after I commenced its revision. I had before designed my work especially for *lecturers* on church history, who need a compendious text for the basis of their instructions; and had therefore only touched upon many things which I supposed would be dilated and explained more fully by the lecturer. But when I began to revise and correct the work for a new edition, it occurred to me that it would be more satisfactory to many, and better subserve the cause of sacred learning, if the book were adapted not merely to the convenience of lecturers, but also to the wants of those who attempt without a teacher to gain a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history. As soon as this thought occurred, my views were changed; and I began at once to supply omissions,

to explain more fully what was obscure, and to give greater precision and distinctness to the whole narration. And hence it is that, in describing the calamities in which the Christians of the first ages were involved, more pains are taken than is commonly done to state precisely the truth; and in tracing the origin and progress of the sects which disturbed the church, greater accuracy is attempted; so, likewise, the new forms of religion, devised by those who love new things, are calmly and candidly described, and with all possible fidelity; and religious contests and disputes are more clearly stated, and their importance more carefully determined; and the history of the Roman pontiffs after the times of Charlemagne, their conflicts and their enterprises, have received more careful attention. I mention these as specimens only of what has been attempted, for the advantage of those who cannot pursue a regular course of church history from their want of books or leisure, and who yet wish to obtain a clear and correct view of the principal facts and transactions. The book, for the most part, may be safely trusted by such readers; and it will afford them as much knowledge as will satisfy one that reads only for practical purposes; and, besides, it will direct to the authors from whom more full information may be obtained.

It would be folly, and would betray ignorance of human imperfection, if I should suppose that no errors *could* be detected, and that nothing needed correction in all the details of so large a history; yet, conscious of my own integrity and good faith, and of the pains I have taken to avoid mistakes, I cannot but hope, that I have rarely so failed that serious evils will result from my errors.

I could add some other prefatory remarks, which would, perhaps, not be useless; but nothing more need be added to enable those to judge correctly of the present work, who will be candid and ingenuous, and who are competent judges in such matters. I therefore conclude by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who has given me strength, amid the infirmities of age and the pressure of other labours and cares, to surmount the difficulties and bear the fatigue of completing the work now given to the public.

Gottingen, March 23, 1755.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Ecclesiastical History defined.—§ 2. Its Divisions.—§ 3. The External History of the Church.—§ 4. which treats of the prosperous — § 5. and the adverse Events.— § 6. The Internal History.—§ 7. which treats of (I.) Ministers.—§ 8, 9. (II.) Doctrines.—§ 10. (III.) Worship.—§ 11. (IV.) Heresies.—§ 12. Events must be traced to their Causes.—§ 13. Means of discovering these Causes, general—§ 14. and particular; in the external—§ 15. and internal History.—§ 16. The Sources of Ecclesiastical History.—§ 17. Qualities of the Historian.—§ 18. He must be free from all Prejudices.—§ 19. Faults of Historians.—§ 20. Uses of Ecclesiastical History, general—§ 21. and special.—§ 22, 23. Method in Ecclesiastical History. Division into Periods—§ 24. Distribution under Heads.

§ 1. *The Ecclesiastical History of the New Dispensation* is a clear and faithful narrative of the external condition, and of the internal state and transactions, of that body of men who have borne the name of *Christians*; and in which events are so traced to their causes, that the providence of God may be seen in the establishment and preservation of the church, and the reader's piety, no less than his intelligence, be advanced by the perusal.

§ 2. The best form of such a history seems to be that, which considers the whole body of Christians as constituting a *society* or community, subjected to lawful authority, and governed by certain laws and institutions. To such a community many external events must happen, which will be favourable to its interests or adverse to them: and, since nothing human is stable and uniform, many things will occur in the bosom of such community tending to change its character. Hence its history may very suitably be divided into its *external* and its *internal* history. In this manner the history of the Christian community, in order to its embracing all the details and promoting the greatest usefulness, should be divided.

§ 3. The *external* history of Christians, or of the Christian community, is properly called a *history of the church*: and it embraces all the occurrences and changes which have visibly befallen this sacred society. And as all communities are sometimes prosperous and sometimes meet with adversity, such also has been the lot of Christians. Hence this part of ecclesiastical history is fitly divided into an account of the *prosperous* and of the *calamitous* events which Christians have experienced.

§ 4. The *prosperous* events, or those tending to the advancement and progress of the Christian interest, proceeded either from the heads and leaders, or from the subordinate members of this community. Its heads and leaders were either *public* characters, such as kings, magistrates, and sovereign pontiffs; or *private* individuals, the doctors, the learned and influential men. Both classes have contributed much, in all ages, to the increase of the church. Men in power, by their authority, laws, beneficence, and even by their arms, have contributed to establish and enlarge the church. And the doctors, and men of learning, of genius, and eminent piety, by their vigorous and noble efforts, their travels, their writings, and their munificence, have successfully recommended the religion of

Christ to those ignorant of it. And common Christians, by their faith, their constancy, their piety, their love to God and men, have induced many to become Christians.

§ 5. The *calamitous* events which have befallen the church, arose either from the fault of Christians, or from the malice and stratagems of their adversaries. There is abundant evidence that Christians themselves, and especially those who presided in the church, have brought much evil upon the body by their negligence, their unholy lives, and their strifes and contentions. The *enemies* of Christ's kingdom were also either *public* or *private* men. *Public* enemies, namely, kings and magistrates, by their laws and penalties, obstructed the progress of Christianity. *Private* men, the philosophers, the idol-worshippers, and the despisers of all religion, assailed the church with false accusations, stratagems, and hostile writings.

§ 6. The *internal history* of the Christian church, treats of the changes to which the church in every age has been exposed, in regard to its distinguishing characteristics as a religious society. It may not unsuitably be called the *history of the Christian religion*. The causes of these internal changes are found, for the most part, in the rulers of the church. These often explained the principles and precepts of Christianity to suit their own fancy or convenience. And as some acquiesced and were submissive, while others frequently resisted, divisions and contentions were the consequence. To all these subjects the intelligent ecclesiastical historian must direct his attention.

§ 7. The first subject in the internal history of the church, is the *history of its rulers* and of its government. Originally, the teachers and the people conjointly administered the affairs of the church. But, in process of time, these teachers assumed a loftier spirit, and, trampling on the rights of the people, they claimed sovereign power, both in sacred and secular affairs. At last, things gradually came to this, that one person held supreme power over the whole church, or, at least, affected to hold it. Among these prefects and guides of the church, some obtained by their writings pre-eminent fame and influence; and as they were by after ages regarded as oracles, and blindly followed, they ought to rank among the *governors* of the church, whether they held offices in it or not.

§ 8. The *history of the laws* by which this religious society was governed, naturally follows the history of its ministers. The laws peculiar to the Christian community are of two kinds. Some are *divine*, proceeding from God himself; and these are found written in those books which Christians very properly believe to be divinely inspired. Others are *human*, or are enactments of the rulers of the community. The former are usually called *doctrines*, and are divided into two species, namely, *doctrines of faith*, which are addressed to the understanding, and *moral doctrines*, which address the heart or will.

§ 9. In the history of these laws or *doctrines*, it should be our first inquiry, In what estimation was the sacred volume held from age to age, and how was it interpreted? For in every period, the state of religion among Christians has depended on the reverence paid to the sacred volume, and on the manner of expounding it. We should next inquire how these divine instructions and laws were treated; in what manner they were inculcated and explained, defended against gainsayers, or debased and corrupted. The last inquiry is, how far Christians were obedient to these divine laws,

or how they lived, and what measures were taken by the rulers of the church to restrain the licentiousness of transgressors.

§ 10. The *human laws* of which we speak, are prescriptions relating to the external worship of God, or religious rites, whether derived from custom or from positive enactment. Rites either *directly* appertain to religion, or *indirectly* refer to it. The former embrace the whole exterior of religious *worship*, both public and private. The latter include everything, except direct worship, that is accounted religious and proper. This part of religious history is very extensive, on account of the variety and the frequent changes in ceremonies. A concise history, therefore, can only touch upon the subject, without descending into details.

§ 11. As in civil republics wars and insurrections sometimes break out, so, in the Christian republic, serious commotions have often arisen on account of both doctrines and rites. The leaders and authors of these seditions are called *heretics*; and the opinions for which they separated from other Christians are called *heresies*. The history of these commotions or heresies should be written with much care. The labour, if expended wisely and with impartiality, will well repay the toil: but it is arduous and difficult. For the leaders of these parties have been treated with much injustice, and their doctrines are misrepresented; nor is it easy to come at the truth in the midst of so much darkness, since most of the writings of those called *heretics* are now lost. Those, therefore, who approach this part of church history, should exclude everything invidious from the name of heretic, and should consider it as used in its more general sense, to denote those who were the occasion, whether by their own or others' fault, of divisions and contests among Christians.

§ 12. In treating of both the external and the internal history of the church, the writer who would be useful, must trace events to their *causes*; that is, he must tell us not only *what* happened, but likewise *how* and *why*. He who narrates the naked facts, only enriches our memory and amuses us; but he who at the same time states the operative causes of events, profits us, for he both strengthens our judgment and increases our wisdom. Yet it must be confessed that caution is here necessary, lest we should fabricate causes, and palm our own waking dreams upon the men long since dead.

§ 13. In exploring the causes of events, besides access to ancient *testimony* and the *history of the times*, a good *knowledge of human nature* is requisite. The historian who understands the human character, the propensities and powers, the passions and weaknesses of man, will readily discover the causes of many things attempted or done in former times. No less important is it, to be acquainted with the *education* and the *opinions* of the persons we treat of; for men commonly regard as praiseworthy and correct, whatever accords with the views and practices of their ancestors and their own sect.

§ 14. To explore causes in the *external* history, a historian should consider the *civil state* of the countries in which the Christian religion was either approved or rejected; and also their *religious state*, that is, the opinions of the mass of the people concerning the Deity and divine worship. For, it will not be difficult to determine why the church was now prosperous and now in trouble, if we know what was the form of government, what the character of the rulers, and what the prevailing religion at the time.

§ 15. To dispel obscurities in the *internal* history, nothing is more con-

ducive than a knowledge of the *history of learning*, and especially of *philosophy*. For, most unfortunately, human learning or philosophy has in every age been allowed more influence in regard to revealed religion than was fit and proper, considering the nature of the two things. Moreover, a good knowledge of the civil government and of the ancient superstitions of different countries, is useful to the same end. For through the prudence, or, rather, the indiscretion of the presiding authorities, many parts of the discipline and worship of the church have been shaped after the pattern of the ancient religions, and no little deference has been paid to the pleasure of sovereigns and to human laws in regulating the church of God.

§ 16. From what *sources* all this knowledge must be drawn, is quite obvious; namely, from the writers of every age who have treated of Christian affairs, and especially from those contemporary with the events; for testimony or authority is the basis of all true history. Yet we ought not to disregard those who, from these sources, have compiled histories and annals. For to refuse proffered assistance, and despise the labours of those who before us have attempted to throw light on obscure subjects, is mere folly.(1)

§ 17. From all this, it will be easy to determine the essential qualifications of a good ecclesiastical historian. He must have no moderate acquaintance with human affairs in general; his learning must be extensive, his mind sagacious and accustomed to reason, his memory faithful, and his judgment sound and matured by long exercise. In his disposition and temperament, he must be patient of labour, persevering, inflexible in his love of truth and justice, and free from every prejudice.

§ 18. Persons who attempt this species of writing are liable to prejudice, especially from three sources; namely, *times*, *persons*, and *opinions*. First, the *times* in which we live often have such ascendancy over us, that we measure past ages by our own; we conclude that what does occur, or can not occur, in our day, in like manner did occur, or could not occur, in former ages. Secondly, the *persons* with whose testimony we are concerned, especially if for ages they have been highly revered for their holiness and their virtues, acquire such an authority with us, as to lead us blindfold. And, thirdly, our attachment to the opinions and doctrines we espouse, often so paralyzes our judgment that, unconsciously, we misapprehend facts. Now from this triple bondage the mind must, as far as possible, be set free.

§ 19. But from this rule, and from others equally obvious and important, how widely ecclesiastical historians of all ages have departed, is too well known. For, not to mention the many who think themselves great historians if they have a good memory, and to pass by those who are governed more by their private interests than by the love of truth, few are the writers, whom neither the sect to which they belong, nor the venerated names

(1) To acquaint us with *all the writers* on ecclesiastical history was the professed object of *Sev. Walth. Stielerus*, in his *Propylæum Historiæ Christianæ*, Luncb., 1696, 4to; and of *Casp. Sagittarius*, *Introductio ad Historiam Eccles.*, singulasque ejus partes; especially vol. i. [2 vols. 4to, Jena, 1694, 1718.—A good account of the most important writers is given by *G. J. Planck*, *Introduction to theological science*,

(in German), vol. ii., and by *J. A. Nösselt* and *C. F. L. Simon*, *Guide to a knowledge of the best works in every branch of theology*, (in German), 2 vols. 8vo, 2d ed., Leipz., 1800–13. Valuable notices of the principal writers are to be found in *J. G. Walch*, *Bibliotheca theol. selecta*, tomo 3tio, and in his *Historia Eccles. Novi Test.*; also in the (German) *Church History of J. M. Schröckh*, vol. i., *Introductio*, pt. iii.—*Tr.*]

of some ancient authors, nor the influence of the age in which they live, can disarm and divert from the truth. In the present age especially, the spirit of the times and the prejudice of opinions, have incredible influence with many. Hence the following arguments so often occurring in the writings of learned men: *These are true sentiments; therefore we must suppose the ancient Christians embraced them. This is correct practice according to Christ's precepts; therefore, doubtless, the earlier Christians so lived. This does not now take place; therefore it did not in ancient times.*

§ 20. Ecclesiastical history, if written by persons free from these and other faults, cannot fail to be greatly beneficial to mankind at large, but especially to the teachers and guides of the church. Whoever shall consider attentively the numerous, the varied, and threatening dangers which the Christian religion has happily surmounted, will doubtless find himself more established in the belief of this religion, and better prepared to withstand the assaults, the cavils, and insidious attacks of the irreligious and profane. The many illustrious examples of virtue with which this history abounds, are admirably suited to awaken pious emotions, and to instil the love of God into lukewarm minds. Those wonderful revolutions and changes which have occurred in every age of the church, originating often from small beginnings, proclaim aloud the providence of God, and the instability and vanity of all human things. Nor is it of small advantage, to know the origin of the numerous and absurd opinions, superstitions, and errors, which still prevail in many parts of the Christian world. For such knowledge will enable us to discover the truth more clearly, to prize it more, and to defend it better. Of the entertainment afforded by this and other parts of church history, I shall say nothing.

§ 21. But public teachers especially, and the ministers of religion, may from this study derive great assistance, in acquiring that practical wisdom which they so much need. Here, the numerous mistakes of even great men, warn them what to shun if they would not embroil the Christian church; there, many illustrious examples of noble and successful effort, are patterns for their imitation. And for combating errors, both those inveterate by age and those of more recent growth, nothing, except the holy Scriptures and sound reason, can be compared with this kind of history. I pass over other advantages which will be found by experience to result from this study; nor will I mention its subserviency to other branches of knowledge, particularly to that of jurisprudence.

§ 22. The two parts of church history, the external and the internal, require a method or arrangement of the work suited to both. The *external* history, being a long and continued narrative, extending through many centuries, requires a distribution into certain intervals of time, for the benefit of the understanding and memory of the reader, and for the preservation of order. Various divisions of time may be adopted. I have preferred the customary one into centuries, because it is the most approved, though it is not free from objections.

§ 23. No small part of these objections, however, will be removed if we superadd a more general division of time, or one into longer periods, bounded by certain great revolutions and changes in the state of the church. Accordingly, the whole of the following history is divided into four books. The *first* contains the history of the church of Christ from its commencement to the time of Constantine the Great. The *second* extends it from

Constantine to Charlemagne. The *third* continues it to the time when Luther began the reformation in Germany. The *fourth* and last brings it down to our own times [or, rather, to the year 1700 ; with a sketch merely of the first part of the 18th century.—*Tr.*].

§ 24. Moreover, ecclesiastical history treats, as we have already seen, of various distinct but kindred *subjects* ; which may properly be arranged under separate heads. Historians have adopted different classifications, such as their fancies or their designs in writing pointed out. The distribution which we prefer has been already indicated [in § 4-11, of this Introduction], and need not be here repeated.

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK I.

CONTAINING
THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
FROM THE
BIRTH OF CHRIST TO CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

CENTURY FIRST.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF OUR SAVIOUR.

§ 1. State of the Roman Empire.—§ 2. Its Evils.—§ 3. Its Advantages.—§ 4. Then in Peace.—§ 5. Other Nations.—§ 6. All were Idolaters.—§ 7. They worshipped different Gods.—§ 8. They were Tolerant.—§ 9. Most of their Gods were deceased Heroes.—§ 10. Pagan Worship.—§ 11. It was confined to Times and Places.—§ 12. The Mysteries.—§ 13. Paganism not the Parent of Virtue.—§ 14. Its Votaries sunk in Vice.—§ 15. How supported by the Priests.—§ 16. The Roman and Grecian Religions.—§ 17. The mixed Religions of the Provinces.—§ 18. Religions beyond the Roman Empire classed.—§ 19. Philosophers unable to Reform the World.—§ 20. The Oriental and the Grecian Philosophy.—§ 21. Some Philosophers subverted all Religion.—§ 22. Others debased it; e. g., Aristotelians.—§ 23. Stoics.—§ 24. Platonics.—§ 25. The Eclectics.—§ 26. Use of this Chapter.

§ 1. AT the time when God became incarnate, a great part of the world was subject to the Romans. Their remoter provinces they either ruled by means of temporary governors and presidents sent from Rome, or suffered to live under their own kings and laws, subject to the sovereign control of the Roman republic. The Senate and people of Rome, though they had not lost all appearance of liberty, were really under the authority of one man, *Augustus*; who was clothed with the titles of emperor, sovereign pontiff, censor, tribune of the people, proconsul; in a word, with every office which conferred general power and pre-eminence in the commonwealth.(1)

§ 2. The Roman government, if we regard only its form and laws, was sufficiently mild and equitable.(2) But the injustice and avarice of the nobles and provincial governors, the Roman lust of conquest and dominion, and the rapacity of the publicans who farmed the revenues of the state,(3) brought incalculable evils on the people. The magistrates and publicans, on the one hand, fleeced the people of their property; and, on the other, this lust of dominion required numerous armies to be raised in the provin-

(1) See *Aug. Campanus* de officio et potestate magistratuum Romanorum. et jurisdictione, lib. i., cap. 1, § 2, p. 3, &c. Geneva, 1725, 4to. [Memoirs of the court of Augustus, by *Tho. Blackwell*, vol. i., ii., 4to. Edinb., 1753—*Schl.*]

(2) See Sir *W. Moyle's* Essay on the constitution of the Rom. government, in his

posth. works, vol. i., p. 1-48. Lond., 1726, 8vo.—*Scip. Maffei* Verona illustrata, lib. ii, p. 65. [*Petro Giannone*, Istoria civile del regno di Napoli, lib. i., princip.—*Tr.*]

(3) [See *P. Burmann*, de Vectigalibus populi Romani, cap. ix., p. 123, &c.—*Schl.*]

ces, which was oppressive to them, and was the occasion of almost perpetual wars and insurrections.

§ 3. Still, this widely-extended dominion of one people, or, rather, of one man, was attended with several advantages. *First*, it brought into union a multitude of nations differing in customs and language. *Secondly*, it gave freer access to the remotest nations.(4) *Thirdly*, it gradually civilized the barbarous nations, by introducing among them the Roman laws and customs. *Fourthly*, it spread literature, the arts, and philosophy in countries where they were not before cultivated. All these greatly aided the ambassadors of our Lord in fulfilling their sacred commission.(5)

§ 4. At the birth of Christ the Roman empire was much freer from commotions than it had been for many years. For though I cannot agree with them who think, with *Orosius*, that the temple of Janus was then shut, and the whole world in profound peace,(6) yet there can be no doubt that the period when our Saviour descended on earth, if compared with the preceding times, was peculiarly peaceful. And, according to St. Paul,(7) this peace was very necessary for those whom Christ commissioned to preach the Gospel.

§ 5. Of the state of those nations which lay without the Roman empire, historic records will not allow us to give so full an account. Nor is it very necessary to our purpose. It is sufficient to know, that the Oriental nations were pressed down by a stern despotism, which their effeminacy of mind and body, and even their religion, led them to bear with patience; while the northern nations enjoyed much greater liberty, which was protected by the rigour of their climate and the consequent energy of their constitutions, aided by their mode of life and their religion.(8)

§ 6. All these nations were plunged in the grossest superstition. For though the idea of one supreme God was not wholly extinct,(9) yet most nations, or, rather, all except the Jews, supposed that each country and province was subjected to a set of very powerful beings, whom they called gods, and whom the people, in order to live happily, must propitiate with various rites and ceremonies. These deities were supposed to differ materially from each other in sex, power, nature, and offices. Some nations, indeed, went beyond others in impiety and absurdity of worship, but all stood chargeable with irrationality and gross stupidity in matters of religion.

§ 7. Thus every nation had a class of deities peculiar to itself, among which one was supposed to be pre-eminent over the rest, and was their king, though subject himself to the laws of *fate* or to an eternal destiny.

(4) See *Nic. Bergier*, *Histoire des grands chemins de l'empire Romain*, 2d ed., Brussels, 1728, 4to, and *Everard Otto*, de Tutela viarum publicarum, pt. ii., p. 314.

(5) *Origen*, among others, acknowledges this: lib. ii., adv. Celsum, p. 79, ed. Cantabr. [See also *Heilmann*, *Comment. de florente litterarum statu et habitu ad relig. Christi initia.—Schl.*]

(6) See *Joh. Massoni* *Templum Jani*, Christo nascente, reseratum. Roter., 1706, 8vo.

(7) See 1 Tim. ii., 2, &c.

(8) *Seneca*, de Ira, lib. ii., cap. 16. Opp. tom. i., p. 36, ed. Gronovii: Fere ita-

que imperia penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cælo utuntur: in frigora septentrionemque vergentibus, inmansueta ingenia sunt, ut ait poeta, *suoque simillima cælo*.

(9) [See *Christopher Meiners'* *Historia doctrinæ de vero Deo*, omnium rerum auctore atque rectore, 2 parts, Lemgo., 1780, p. 548, 12mo, where, from a critical investigation, proof is adduced that the ancient pagan nations were universally ignorant of the Creator and Governor of the world, till *Anaxagoras*, about 450 years before Christ, and afterward other philosophers, conceived that the world must have had an intelligent architect.—*Tr.*]

For the Oriental nations had not the same gods as the Gauls, the Germans, and the other northern nations; and the Grecian deities were essentially different from those of the Egyptians, who worshipped brute animals, plants, and various productions of nature and art.(10) Each nation likewise had its own method of worshipping and propitiating its gods, differing widely from the rites of other nations. But, from their ignorance or from other causes, the Greeks and Romans maintained that *their* gods were universally worshipped; and they therefore gave the names of their own gods to the foreign deities, which has caused immense confusion and obscurity in the history of the ancient religions, and produced numberless errors in the works of very learned men.(11)

§ 8. But this variety of gods and religions in the pagan nations, produced no wars or feuds among them, unless, perhaps, the Egyptians are an exception.(12) Yet the Egyptian wars, waged to avenge their gods, cannot properly be called religious wars, [not being undertaken either to propagate or to suppress any one form of religion]. Each nation, without concern, allowed its neighbours to enjoy their own views of religion, and to worship their own gods in their own way. Nor need this tolerance greatly surprise us.(13) For they who regard the world as being divided, like a great country, into numerous provinces, each subject to a distinct order of deities, cannot despise the gods of other nations, nor think of compelling all others to pay worship to their *national* gods. The Romans in particular, though they would not allow the public religions to be changed or multiplied, yet gave the citizens full liberty to observe foreign religions in private, and to hold meetings and feasts, and to erect temples and groves to those foreign deities in whose worship there was nothing inconsistent with the public safety and the existing laws.(14)

§ 9. The greater part of the gods of all nations were ancient heroes, famous for their achievements and their worthy deeds; such as kings, generals, and founders of cities; and likewise females who were highly distinguished for their deeds and discoveries, whom a grateful posterity had deified. To these some added the more splendid and useful objects

(10) This was long since remarked by *Athanasius*, *Oratio contra gentes*, Opp., tom. i., p. 25. [See *Le Clerc*, *Ars critica*, pt. ii., sect. i., c. 13, § 11, and *Bibliothèque Choisie*, tom. vii., p. 84. *W. Warburton's* Divine legation of Moses demonstrated, tom. ii., p. 233, &c. And, respecting the Egyptian gods, see *P. E. Jablonsky*, *Pantheon Ægyptiorum*, Francf. ad Viadr., 1750, 8vo. *F. S. von Schmidt*, *Opuscula*, quibus res antiquæ, præcipue Ægyptiacæ explanantur. 1765, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

(11) [Dr. *MacLaine* here subjoins a long note, asserting that the gods worshipped in different pagan countries were so similar, that they might properly be called by the same names. He therefore thinks, that Dr. *Mosheim* has overrated the mischief done to the history of idolatry by the Greek and Roman writers. But there was certainly little resemblance between Woden and Mercury, Thor and Jupiter, Friga and Venus; or between the

Roman deities and Bralhma, Vishnoo, Siva, and the other gods of Hindostan. And as the classic writers give very imperfect descriptions of foreign deities, and leave us to infer most of their characteristics from the names assigned them, it is evident that Dr. *Mosheim's* remark is perfectly just.—*Tr.*]

(12) See what *Laur. Pignorius* has collected on this subject, in his *Expositio mensæ Isiacæ*, p. 41, &c.

(13) [Though extolled by *Shaftsbury* among others, *Characteristics*, vol. ii., p. 166, and vol. iii., p. 60, 86, 87, 154, &c.—*Schl.*]

(14) See *Corn. à Bynekershoeckh*, *Dissert. de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos*, in his *Opuscula*, l. Bat., 1719, 4to. [*Warburton's* Divine legation of Moses, vol. i., p. 307. Compare *Lary*, *Hist. Rom.*, lib. xxv., l. and xxxix., 18, and *Valer. Max.*, i., 3.—*Schl.* See also *N. Lardner*, *Credib. of Gospel Hist.*, pt. i., b. i., c. 8, § 3-6.—*Tr.*]

in the natural world, among which the sun, moon, and stars, being pre-eminent, received worship from nearly all; and some were not ashamed to pay divine honours to mountains, rivers, trees, the earth, the ocean, the winds, and even to diseases, to virtues and vices, and to almost every conceivable object, or, at least, to the deities supposed to preside over these objects.(15)

§ 10. The worship of these deities consisted in numerous ceremonies, with sacrifices, offerings, and prayers. The ceremonies were, for the most part, absurd and ridiculous, and throughout debasing, obscene, and cruel. The sacrifices and offerings varied, according to the nature and offices of the different gods.(16) Most nations sacrificed animals, and, shocking to relate, not a few of them likewise immolated human victims.(17) Their prayers were quite insipid, and void of piety, both in their form and matter.(18) Presiding over this whole worship, were pontiffs, priests, and servants of the gods, divided into many classes, whose business it was to see that the rites were duly performed. These persons were supposed to enjoy the friendship and familiar converse of the gods, and they basely abused their authority to impose on the people.

§ 11. The religious worship of most nations was confined to certain places or temples,(19) and to certain times or stated days. In the temples [and groves] the statues and images of their gods were located, and these images were supposed to be animated in an inexplicable manner by the gods themselves. For, senseless as the worshippers of imaginary gods truly were, they did not wish to be accounted worshippers of lifeless substances, brass, stone, and wood, but of a deity which they maintained to be present in the image, provided it was consecrated in due form.(20)

§ 12. Besides this common worship to which all had free access, there were, among both Orientals and Greeks, certain recondite and concealed rites called *mysteries*, to which very few were admitted. Candidates for initiation had first to give satisfactory proof to the hierophants of their good faith and patience, by various most troublesome ceremonies. When initiated they could not divulge any thing they had seen, without exposing their lives to imminent danger.(21) Hence the interior of these hidden rites, is at this day little known. Yet we know that, in some of the mysteries, many things were done which were repugnant to modesty and decency, and in all of them, the discerning might see that the deities there worshipped were more distinguished for their vices than for their virtues.(22)

(15) See the learned work of *G. J. Vossius*, de Idololatria, lib. i.—iii. [and La mythologie et les fables expliquées par l'histoire, par l'Abbé *Banier*, Paris, 1738–40, 8 vols. 12mo, and *Fr. Creutzers'* Symbolik u. Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen. Leipz. u. Darmst., 1810–12, 4 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(16) See *J. Saubertus*, de Sacrificiis veterum; republished by *T. Crenius*, L. Bat., 1699, 8vo.

(17) See *H. Columna*, ad Fragmenta Ennii, p. 29, and *J. Saubertus*, de Sacrificiis Vet., cap. xxi., p. 455.

(18) See *Matt. Browerius* à *Niedeeck*, de Adorationibus veterum populorum. Traj.,

1711, 8vo. [and *Saubertus*, ubi supra, p. 343, &c.—*Schl.*]

(19) [“Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Germans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shady retreats of consecrated groves.”—*Macl.*]

(20) *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes, lib. vi., p. 254, ed. *Heraldi*. *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, lib. vii., c. 33, Opp., tom. vii., p. 161, ed. *Benedict*. *Julian*, Misopogon., p. 361, ed. *Spanheim*.

(21) See *Jo. Meursius*, de Mysteriis Eleusyniis; and *Darid Clarkson*, Discourse on Liturgies, § iv.

(22) *Cicero*, Disput. Tusculan., lib. i.,

§ 13. The whole pagan system had not the least efficacy to excite and cherish virtuous emotions in the soul. For, in the *first* place, the gods and goddesses to whom the public homage was paid, instead of being patterns of virtue, were patterns rather of enormous vices and crimes. (23) They were considered, indeed, as superior to mortals in power, and as exempt from death, but in all things else as on a level with us. In the *next* place, the ministers of this religion, neither by precept nor by example, exhorted the people to lead honest and virtuous lives, but gave them to understand, that all the homage required of them by the gods was comprised in the observance of the traditional rites and ceremonies. (24) And, *lastly*, the doctrines inculcated respecting the rewards of the righteous and the punishments of the wicked in the future world, were some of them dubious and uncertain, and others more adapted to promote vice than virtue. (25) Hence the wiser pagans themselves, about the time of the Saviour's birth, contemned and ridiculed the whole system.

cap. 13; [and de Leg., cap. 24. *Varro*, cited by *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, lib. iv., cap. 31. *Eusebius*, Præpar. Evangel., lib. ii., c. 3.—*Schl.* See also *Warburton's* Divine legat., vol. i., lib. ii., sec. 4; who is confronted by *J. Leland*, Advantages and necessity of the Christian Rev., vol. i., ch. 8, 9, p. 151–190. *C. Meiners*, über die Mysterien der Alten; in his Miscel. philos. works, vol. iii., Leipz., 1776. The Baron de *Sainte Croix*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion secrète des anciens peuples, &c., Paris, 1784, 8vo; and (P. J. Vogel's) Briefe über die Mysterien, which are the 2d collection of Letters on Freemasonry, Nuremb., 1784, 12mo. It has been maintained, that the design of at least some of these mysteries was to inculcate the grand principles of natural religion, such as the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, the importance of virtue, &c., and to explain the vulgar polytheism as symbolical of these great truths. But this certainly needs better proof. It is more probable that the later pagan philosophers, who lived after the light of Christianity had exposed the abominations of polytheism, were the principal authors of this moral interpretation of the vulgar religion, which they falsely pretended was taught in the mysteries, while, in reality, those mysteries were probably mere supplements to the vulgar mythology and worship, and of the same general character and spirit. See an elaborate essay in the Quarterly Christian Spectator, vol. ix., No. III., for Sept., 1837, p. 478–520, where one of the most profound Greek scholars of our country ably maintains the following proposition: “that, so far as anything can be known of them, they [the mysteries] were not essentially different from the public worship of heathenism; that their importance did not consist in teaching exalted

doctrines concerning God and the soul; that, in truth, no secret doctrines properly pertained to them; and that, whatever high truths may have been suggested to any of the initiated, those truths were of ‘private interpretation,’ or were sewed on to the mysteries after the rise of philosophy.”—*Tr.*

(23) *Ovid*, de Tristibus, lib. ii., v. 287, &c.

Quis locus est templis augustior! hæc quoque vitet,

In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam.

Cùm steterit Jovis æde: Jovis succurret in æde,

Quàm multas matres fecerit ille Deus.

Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subibit,

Pellicibus multis hanc doluisse Deam.

Pallade conspectâ, natum de crimine virgo

Sustulerit quare, quæret, Erichthonium.

[Compare *Plato*, de Leg., lib. i., p. 776, and de Republ., lib. ii., p. 430, &c., ed. Ficini; *Isocrates*, Encom. Busiridis, Oratt., p. 462; and *Seneca*, de Vita beata, cap. 26.—*Schl.*]

(24) See *J. Barbeyrac*, Preface to his French translation of Puffendorf's Law of nature and nations, § vi. [Yet there were some intelligent pagans who had better views, such as Socrates and the younger Pliny. The latter, in his Panegyric on Trajan, cap. 3, n. 5, says: Animadverto,—etiam Deos ipsos, non tam accuratis adorantium precibus, quàm innocentia et sanctitate lætari; gratioremque existimari, qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem, quàm qui meditatum carmen intulerit.—*Schl.*]

(25) [What the Greeks and Romans said of the Elysian Fields, was not only fabulous in its very aspect, but it held out the prospect of voluptuous pleasures, opposed to true virtue. The more northern nations

§ 14. And hence a universal corruption of morals prevailed; and crimes, which at this day cannot be named with decency, were then practised with entire impunity.(26) Those who would see proof of this, may read *Juvenal* and *Perseus* among the Latins, and *Lucian* among the Greeks; or, if this seems too painful, let them reflect on the gladiatorial shows, the sodomy and unnatural lusts, the facility of divorce, both among Greeks and Romans, the custom of exposing infants and procuring abortions, and the stews consecrated to the gods; against all which the laws raised no obstructions.(27)

§ 15. Men of but common discernment, could see the deformity of these religions; but they were met by the crafty priests with two spurious arguments. *First*, the miracles and prodigies which were affirmed to have taken place, and still to be daily witnessed, in the temples and before the shrines of the gods; and, *secondly*, the divination and oracles, by which these gods were said to have foretold future events. In regard to both, the common people were miserably imposed upon by the artifices of the priests, and the discerning saw it.(28) But the latter had to laugh with caution in order to be safe. For the priests stood ready to accuse of treason against the gods, before a raging and superstitious multitude, all such as exposed their religious frauds.

§ 16. At the time chosen by the Son of God for his birth among men, the Roman religion, as well as arms, pervaded a large part of the world. To be acquainted with this religion, is nearly the same as to be acquainted with the Grecian superstition.(29) Yet there is some difference between them; for, besides the institutions of Numa and others, invented for political ends, the Romans superadded to the Grecian fables some Italic and Tuscan fictions, and also gave the Egyptian gods a place among their deities.(30)

promised a happy immortality, only to those who distinguished themselves by a martial spirit and the slaughter of numerous foes; that is, to the enemies of mankind. And the eternal bliss which they promised to these warriors, was only a continued indulgence in vile lusts. How could such hopes excite to virtue! Moreover, the doctrine of even these rewards and punishments, was not an article of faith among the Greeks and Romans, but every one believed what he pleased concerning it; and, at the time of Christ's birth, the followers of *Epicurus* were numerous; and while many denied, most others doubted, the reality of future retributions. *Polybius*, Hist., lib. vi., c. 54. *Sallust*, Bell. Catil.—*Schl.*]

(26) *Cyprian*, Epist. i., p. 2, ed. Baluz., describes at large the debased morals of the pagans. See also *Cornelii Adami* Exercit. de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus, in his Exercitt. Exeget. Exercit. V. Gröning., 1712, 4to; [and, what is still better authority, *St. Paul* to the Romans, chap. i., passim.—*Tr.*]

(27) [On the subject of this and several preceding sections, the reader may find satisfactory proof in that elaborate and candid

work, The advantage and necessity of the Christian Revelation, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world; by *J. Leland*, D.D., 2d ed. Dublin, 1735, 2 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(28) [*Schlegel* here introduces a long note, showing that *Dr. Mosheim*, till towards the close of his life, did not utterly reject that common opinion of the ancients, that *evil spirits* sometimes aided the pagan priests, particularly in regard to their oracles. But *Dr. Mosheim* did, we are told by his pupil, come at last into the opinion now generally admitted, namely, that the pagan oracles were all mere cheats, proceeding from the craft of the priests. See *Van Dale*, de Oraculis ethnicorum; among his Diss. Amstel., 1696, 4to; and *Bern. Fontenelle*, Histoire des oracles, 1687; with the Jesuit, *J. F. Baltus*, Réponse à l'histoire des oracles, &c., Strasb., 1707, 8vo; and Suite de la Réponse, &c., 1708, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(29) See *Dionys. Halicar.*, Antiquitatt. Romanor., lib. vii., cap. 72, tom. i., p. 460, ed. Hudson.

(30) See *Sam. Petitus*, ad Leges Atticas, lib. i., tit. i., p. 71. [*Lactantius*, Divinarum Institut., lib. i., cap. 20.—*Schl.*]

§ 17. In the Roman provinces, new forms of paganism were gradually produced, compounded of the ancient religions of the inhabitants and that of their Roman conquerors. For these nations, who, before their subjugation, had their peculiar gods and religious rites, were persuaded by degrees to adopt many of the Roman usages. This was good policy in the Romans, whose interests were promoted by the extinction of the inhuman rites of the barbarous nations; at the same time, the levity of those nations, and their desire to please their masters, favoured the object.(31)

§ 18. The most prominent religions beyond the bounds of the Roman empire, may be divided into two classes, the *civil* and the *military*. To the first class belong the religions of most of the Oriental nations, especially of the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Indians. For whoever carefully inspects their religions, will see that they are adapted merely to answer political objects; to protect the dignity and authority of kings, to preserve the public tranquillity, and to promote the civil virtues. To the second class must be referred the religions of the northern nations. For all that was inculcated among the Germans, Britains, Celts, Goths, &c., respecting the gods and the worship due to them, was evidently suited to awaken and to cherish the military virtues, fortitude, bravery, and contempt of death. A careful examination of these religions will evince the truth of these statements.

§ 19. No nation was so rude and barbarous, as not to contain some persons capable of discerning the absurdity of the popular religions. But among these men some lacked the power and authority, others the disposition, and all the wisdom, necessary to produce a reformation. This could not well be better exemplified, than it actually is, by the attempts of the Greek and Roman philosophers to reform the vulgar superstitions. They advanced many tolerably correct ideas respecting the divine nature and moral duties, and they exposed, with some success, the errors of the prevailing religion; but all was so intermixed with wild and baseless speculations, as clearly to show that it belongs to God only, and not to men, to teach the truth undebased and free from errors.

§ 20. Among the more civilized nations at the time the Son of God appeared, two species of philosophy prevailed; namely, the *Grecian*, which was also adopted by the Romans, and the *Oriental*, which had many followers in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and among the Jews. The former was appropriately called *philosophy*; the latter, by such as spoke Greek, was called *γρῶσις*, that is, *knowledge* (ss. Θεῶ) of God; because its followers pretended to restore the lost knowledge of the supreme God.(32) The advocates of both kinds of philosophy, were split into numerous contending sects; yet with this difference, that all the sects of Oriental philosophy set out with one and the same fundamental principle, and therefore, were agreed in regard to many points of doctrine; but the Greeks were not agreed about the first principles of human wisdom. Of the Oriental philosophy we shall give account hereafter; of the Grecian philosophy and its sects notice will be taken here.

(31) [*Strabo*, *Geograph.*, lib. iv., p. 189, &c.—*Schl.*]

(32) *St. Paul* mentions and disapproves both kinds of philosophy; namely, the Grecian, *Colos.* ii., 8, and the Oriental, or *γρῶσις*, *1 Tim.* vi., 20. [*Dr. Mosheim* has been censured for his confident assertions

in regard to the existence and prevalence of an Oriental philosophy, going under the name of *γρῶσις*, so early as the days of *Christ* and his apostles. On this subject more will be said hereafter. See cent. i., pt. ii., ch. i., n. 7.—*Tr.*]

§ 21. Some of the Grecian sects declared open war against all religion; others admitted, indeed, the existence of God and of religion, but they obscured the truth rather than threw light upon it. Of the former class were the *Epicureans* and the *Academics*. The Epicureans maintained, that the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny) neither did nor could extend their providential care to human affairs; that the soul was mortal; that *pleasure*(33) was to be sought as man's ultimate end; and that virtue was to be prized only for its subserviency to this end. The Academics denied the possibility of arriving at truth and certainty, and therefore held it uncertain whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul is mortal or survives the body; whether virtue is preferable to vice, or the contrary.(34) At the birth of Jesus Christ, these two sects were very numerous and influential, being favoured by the men of rank and by nearly all the opulent.(35)

(33) ["The ambiguity of the word *pleasure* has produced many disputes in the explanation of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure* be understood only *sensual* gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indisputably monstrous. But if it be taken in a larger sense, and be extended to intellectual and moral objects, in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those Christian philosophers who maintain that *self-love* is the only spring of all human affections and actions?" —*Macl.* Epicurus distinguished between *corporeal* pleasure and *mental*. But he accounted both *sensitive*, because he held the soul to be *material*. His conceptions of pleasure did not extend beyond *natural pleasures*; the chief of which he supposed to be a calm and tranquil state of *mind*, undisturbed by any fear of God or by any solicitude about the future, and attended with freedom from bodily pain. His system, therefore, denied the very idea of *moral* or *religious* pleasures, and it required *atheism* as its foundation. See *Stäudlin's* *Geschich. d. Moralphilos.*, p. 236, &c. Hanov., 1822, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(34) [The Academics or Platonists became indeed skeptical, especially those of the Middle Academy. Some real Pyrrhonists likewise assumed the name of Academics. Still it is probable the great body of Academics, like *Cicero*, who is accounted one of them, merely held that all human knowledge is *imperfect*, that is, falls short of *certainty*; that, of course, we are obliged in all cases to act upon *probabilities*, of which there are different degrees.—*Tr.*]

(35) The Epicureans were the most numerous of the two. See *Cicero*, de Finibus bonor. et malor., lib. i., cap. 7, lib. ii., cap. 14, and Disput. Tuscul., lib. v., cap. 10. Hence *Juvenal*, Satyr. xiii., v. 86, &c., thus complains of the many atheists at Rome: Sunt in fortunæ qui casibus omnia poiant,

Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,
Naturâ volvente vices et lucis et anni:
Atque idæo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tan-
gunt.

[Dr. *Mosheim*, in these sections, is giving the dark side of pagan philosophy. Like his other translators, therefore, I would aim so to soften his pictures, that the less informed reader may not be misled. This, I am persuaded, Dr. Mosheim would himself approve, as may be inferred from the following long note, inserted apparently for such a purpose in the parallel passage of his *Comment. de Reb. Christ. ante Constant.*, p. 17, 18. "I cannot agree with those who maintain, that every one of the philosophers of those times, even such as discoursed well on religious subjects, was hostile to all religion. I think those learned moderns have gone too far, who have endeavoured to prove that every sect of the philosophers, either openly or covertly, aimed to rip up the foundations of all religion. Are we to believe that not one of the many great and worthy men of those times, however free from ill intentions, was so fortunate as to make a proper use of his reason? Must all those who professed theism, and spoke sublimely of the divine perfections, be regarded as impostors, who said one thing and meant another? Yet the celebrated and acute W. *Warburton*, to mention no others, lately expended much ingenuity and learning to bring us to such conclusions. See his very elaborate and noted work, entitled *The divine Legation*, &c., vol. i., p. 332, &c., and p. 419, &c. He would have us think, that all the philosophers who taught the immortality of the soul, secretly denied it; that they held *Nature* to be the only Deity, and human souls to be particles severed from the soul of the world, to which they return at the death of the body. But not to mention that he cites only Grecian philosophers, while other nations had their philosophers also dif-

§ 22. To the second class belong the *Aristotelians*, the *Stoics*, and the *Platonics*: none of whom spoke of God, religion, and moral duties, in a manner to be of much service to mankind. The god of *Aristotle*, is like the principle of motion in a machine. He is a being regardless of human affairs, and happy in his own contemplations. Such a god, differing but little from the god of *Epicurus*, we have no reason either to love or to fear. Whether this philosopher held the soul to be mortal or immortal, is at least doubtful.(36) Now what solid and sound precepts of virtue and piety can that man give, who denies the providence of God, and not obscurely intimates that the soul is mortal?

§ 23. The god of the *Stoics* has a little more of majesty; nor does he sit musing supinely, above the heavens and the stars. Yet he is described as a *corporeal* being, united to matter by a necessary connexion; and, moreover, as subject to *fate*: so that *he* can bestow neither rewards nor punishments.(37) That this sect held to the extinction of the soul, at death, is allowed by all the learned. Now such doctrines take away the strongest motives to virtue. And accordingly, the moral system of the *Stoics* is a *body* that is fair and beautiful, but without sinews and active limbs.(38)

§ 24. *Plato* seems to have exceeded all the other philosophers in wisdom. For he held the world to be governed by an independent, powerful, and intelligent God; and he taught men, what to fear and what to hope for, after death. Yet his doctrines not only rest on very slender foundations, and are exceedingly obscure, but they represent the supreme Creator as destitute of several perfections,(39) and as limited to a certain place. His

fering widely from the Grecian, the renowned author depends not on plain and explicit testimony, which seems necessary to justify so heavy a charge, but merely on conjectures, on single examples, and on inferences from the doctrines held by certain philosophers. If this kind of proof be allowed, if single instances and inferences are sufficient to convict men of duplicity when no shadow of suspicion appears in their language, who will be found innocent! Though but an ordinary man, and far inferior to Warburton, yet I could prove that all the theologians in Christendom disbelieve utterly what they teach in public; and that they covertly aim to instil the poison of impiety into men's minds; if I might be allowed to assail them in the manner this learned writer assails the philosophers."—*Tr.*]

(36) See the notes on my Latin translation of *R. Cudworth's Intellectual System*, tom. i., p. 66, 500; tom. ii., p. 1171; and *Mich. Mourgues*, Plan théologique du Pythagorisme, tom. i., p. 75, &c.

(37) ["Thus is the Stoical doctrine of *fate* generally represented, but not more generally than unjustly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, seems to have signified no more, in the intention of the wisest of that sect, than the plan of government formed originally in the divine mind, a

plan all wise and perfect, and from which, of consequence, the supreme Being, morally speaking, can never depart. So that when Jupiter is said by the Stoics to be subject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and acts ever in conformity with his supreme perfections. The following remarkable passage of *Seneca*, drawn from the fifth chapter of his book *de Providentia*, is sufficient to confirm the explication we have here given of the *Stoical fate*. Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector, scripsit quidem *fata*, sed sequitur. Semper parat, semel jussit."—*Macl.* This fine apology will not bear a strict scrutiny. The Stoics themselves differed in opinion, and they generally had indistinct notions. But most of them held *fate* to be rather a *physical* than a *moral* necessity; though some of them, at times, confounded it with Jove, nature, or a pantheistic god, as *Seneca* does in the passage quoted.—*Tr.*]

(38) These remarks receive some illustration from my note on *Cudworth's Intel. Syst.*, tom. i., p. 517.

(39) [He ascribed to God neither omnipotence, nor omnipresence, nor omniscience.—*Schl.* But *Dr. Maclaine* here enters his dissent. He says, "All the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that

doctrine concerning demons and the human soul, is singularly adapted to produce and encourage superstition.(40) Nor will his system of morals command very high estimation, if we examine it in all its parts, and inquire into its first principles.(41)

§ 25. As all these sects held many things inconsistent with sound reason, and were addicted to never-ending contentions and debates, some moderate and well-disposed men concluded to follow none of them implicitly, but to glean from *all* whatever was good and consonant to reason, and reject the rest. Hence originated in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria, a new mode of philosophizing called the *eclectic*. One *Potamon*, of Alexandria, has been represented as its author; but the subject has its difficulties.(42) That this sect flourished at Alexandria in the age of our Saviour, is manifest from the Jewish *Philo*, who philosophized according to its principles.(43) These *Eclectics* held *Plato* in the highest estimation; but they unscrupulously modified his doctrines by incorporating what they pleased from the other philosophers.(44)

§ 26. It will be easy to see, what inference should be drawn from this account of the lamentable state of the world at the time of Christ's birth. It may serve to teach us, that the human race was then wholly corrupt, and that a divine teacher was needed to instruct mankind in the true principles of religion and morality, and to recall the wanderers into the paths

philosopher." I wish he had given proof of this assertion, if he was able to make it good.—*Tr.*]

(40) [He believed, that God employs good and evil demons in the government of the world, and that men can have commerce with these demons. A person believing this, may easily be led to regard idolatry as not very irrational.—*Schl.*]

(41) The defects of the Platonic philosophy are copiously, but not very accurately, depicted by *Fran. Baltus*, in a French work, *Defense des peres accuses de Platonisme*; Paris, 1711, 4to. [*Plato* has, moreover, been accused of *Spinozism*. For *Bayle* (*Continuation des pensées diverses sur la Comete*, &c., cap. 25) and *Gundling* (in *Otiis*, fasc. 2, and in *Gundlingianis*, th. 43 and 44) tax him with confounding God with matter. But *Zimmermann* (*Opusc.*, tom. i., p. 762, &c.) and the elder *Sehelhorn* (*Amœnitatt. literar.*, tom. ix., xii., and xiii.) have defended the character of *Plato*.—*Schl.*]

(42) [*J. Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.*, tom. ii., p. 193, has shown, that in regard to the controversies maintained by *Heumann*, *Hasæus* and others, respecting this nearly unknown *Potamon*, the probability is, that he lived about the close of the second century; that his speculations had little effect; and that *Ammonius* is to be regarded as the founder of the *Eclectic* sect. Yet this will not forbid our believing, what *Brucker* himself admits, that there were *some* Grecian philosophers as early as the times of Christ, who speculated very much as the *Eclectics*

afterward did, though the few followers they had did not merit the title of a *sect*.—*Schl.*]

(43) [For he philosophized in the manner of *Clemens Alex.*, *Origen*, and the other Christian doctors, who were certainly *Eclectics*. For the most part he follows *Plato*, and hence many account him a pure Platonist. But he often commends the Stoics, Pythagoreans, and others, and adopts their opinions.—*Schl.*]

(44) See *Godfr. Olcarius*, de *Philosophia Eclectica*, *James Brucker*, and others. [On the philosophy, as well as the vulgar polytheism of the ancient pagans, the best work for the mere English reader, seems to be that already mentioned, *J. Leland's* *Advantage and necessity of the Christian revelation*, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heathen world, second ed., 1765, 2 vols. 8vo. The history of philosophy among the ancients has not been critically and ably written in English, nor by Englishmen. *Stanley's* *lives*, &c., 1655, 4to, is full of mistakes; and *Enfield's* abridgment of *Brucker*, is quite superficial. The best general works are *J. Brucker's* *Historia critica philosophiæ*, Lips., 1741–67, 6 vols 4to, and the more recent German works by *Tiedemann* (6 vols. 8vo, 1791–97), *Buhle* (7 vols. 8vo, 1796–1804), *Tennemann* (12 vols. 8vo, 1798–1820), and *Rixner*, 3 vols. 8vo, 1822. The history of moral philosophy or ethics, is well treated by *Cp. Meiners* (*krit. Geschichte*, 2 vols. 8vo, 1800–1) and *C. F. Stäudlin*, *Gesch. der Moralphilosophie*, 1822, p. 1055, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

of virtue and piety. And it may teach those who before were ignorant of it, how great advantages and supports, in all the circumstances of life, the human family have derived from the advent of Christ, and from the religion which he taught. Many despise and ridicule the Christian religion, not knowing that to it they are indebted for all the blessings they enjoy.

CHAPTER II.

THE CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE JEWS AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

§ 1. Herod the Great then reigned.—§ 2. State of the Jews after his Death.—§ 3. Their Troubles and Calamities.—§ 4. which were increased by their leading Men.—§ 5. Their Religion greatly corrupted, both among the Common People—§ 6. and among their Teachers, who were divided into three Sects.—§ 7. Their Dissensions.—§ 8. Their Toleration of each other.—§ 9. The Essenes.—§ 10. The Therapeutæ.—§ 11. Moral Doctrines of these Sects.—§ 12. Low State of Religion among the People.—§ 13. The Kabbala, a Source of Error.—§ 14. Their Form of Worship, debased by Pagan Rites.—§ 15. Causes of the Corruption of the Nation.—§ 16. Yet Religion not wholly extinct.—§ 17. The Samaritans.—§ 18. State of the Jews out of Palestine.

§ 1. THE state of the Jewish people, among whom the Saviour chose to be born, was little better than that of other nations. *Herod*, whose crimes procured him the title of the *Great*, then governed, or, rather, oppressed the nation, being a tributary king under the Romans. He drew on himself universal hatred by his cruelties, jealousies, and wars; and he exhausted the wealth of the unhappy nation by his mad luxury, his excessive magnificence, and his immoderate largesses. Under his administration Roman luxury and great licentiousness spread over Palestine.(1) In religion he was professedly a Jew, but he copied the manners of those who despise all religion.

§ 2. On the death of this tyrant, the Romans allowed *Archelaus*, his son, with the title of *Exarch*, to reign over half of Palestine [viz., Judea, Samaria, and Idumea]; the other half was divided between two other sons of Herod, *Antipas* and *Philip*. Archelaus copied after the vices of his father; and therefore, in the tenth year of his reign, he was publicly accused before Augustus and deprived of his crown.(2) The countries he had governed were now reduced to the form of a Roman province, and were annexed to Syria. This change in the form of government, brought heavy troubles and calamities upon the Jews, and at last destroyed the nation.

§ 3. The Romans did not, indeed, wholly prohibit the Jews from retaining their national laws, and the religion established by Moses. Their religious affairs were still conducted by a high priest, with priests and Le-

(1) See *Christ. Noldii*, Historia Idumæa, in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus, tom. ii., p. 333, &c. *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. i., part. i., p. 27, &c. *H. Noris*, Cœnotoph. Pisan., ii., 6. *H. Prideaux*, Connexions, &c., part. ii., lib. viii. *Chr. Cel-*

larius, Historia Herodum, in his Diss. Acad., part. i., and especially the Jewish historian, *Flavius Josephus*, in his Wars of the Jews.

(2) [*Josephus*, Antiq. Jud., lib. xvii., cap. 13, and de Bello Jud., lib. ii., cap. 6.—*Schl.*]

vites under him, and by their national senate or Sanhedrim. The exterior of their worship, with a few exceptions, remained unaltered. But the amount of evil brought upon this miserable people, by the presence of the Romans among them, whom they viewed as polluted and detestable, by the cruelty and avarice of the governors, and by the frauds and rapacity of the publicans, is almost incalculable. Unquestionably, those Jews lived more comfortably who were subject to the other two sons of Herod.

§ 4. But the measure of liberty and comfort allowed to the Jews by the Romans, was wholly dissipated by the profligacy and crimes of those who pretended to be patriots and guardians of the nation. Their principal men, their high priests, as we learn from Josephus, were abandoned wretches, who had purchased their places by bribes or by deeds of iniquity, and who maintained their ill-acquired authority by every species of flagitious acts. The other priests, and all who held any considerable office, were not much better. The multitude, excited by such examples, ran headlong into every sort of iniquity, and by their unceasing robberies and seditions they armed against themselves both the justice of God and the vengeance of men.(3)

§ 5. Two religions then flourished in Palestine, viz., the *Jewish* and the *Samaritan*; between the followers of which a deadly hatred prevailed. The nature of the former is set forth in the Old Testament. But in the age of the Saviour, it had lost much of its primitive form and character. The people universally were infected with certain prevalent and pernicious errors, and the more learned were at variance on points of the greatest moment. All looked for a deliverer; not, however, such a one as God had promised, but a powerful warrior and a vindicator of their national liberties.(4) All placed the sum of religion in an observance of the Mosaic ritual, and in certain external duties towards their own countrymen. All excluded the rest of mankind from the hope of salvation, and, of course, whenever they dared, treated them with hatred and inhumanity.(5) To these fruitful sources of vice, must be added various absurd and superstitious opinions concerning the Divine nature, genii, magic, &c., which they had partly brought with them from the Babylonian captivity, and partly imbibed from the neighbouring Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians.(6)

§ 6. The learned, who pretended to a superior knowledge of the law and of theology, were divided into various sects and parties,(7) among

(3) [See *Josephus*, de Bello Jud., lib. v., cap. 13, § 6, and *Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. i., cap. 16.—*Schl.*]

(4) [This is proved by *J. Basnage*, Hist. des Juifs, tom. v., cap. 10. That not only the Pharisees, but all Jews of whatever sect, both in and out of Palestine, were expecting a Messiah, is shown by Dr. Mosheim, in his Commentt. de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 40, from the following texts, John i., 20–25; x., 24, &c.; xii., 34. Matt. ii., 4–6; xxi., 9; xxvi., 63, &c.—*Schl.*]

(5) [Hence other nations, not without reason, regarded the Jews as enemies of mankind. See the examples collected by *J. Elsner*, Observatt. Sacr. in N. T., tom. ii., p. 274.—*Schl.*]

(6) [See *Th. Gale*, Observv. ad *Jamblichum*, de Myster. Aegypt., p. 206, and *G. Sale*, Preface to his Eng. transl. of the Koran, p. 72. Even *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud., lib. iii., c. 7, § 2, admits that the Jewish religion was corrupted among the Babylonians.—*Schl.*]

(7) Besides these three more noted sects, there were, undoubtedly, others among the Jews in the time of Christ. The *Herodians* are mentioned in the sacred volume, the *Gaulonites* by *Josephus*, and other sects by *Epiphanius*, and by *Hegesippus* in *Eusebius*; all of which cannot be supposed to be mere fictions. [Dr. Mosheim's additional remarks on this subject, in his Commentt. de Reb. Chr. ante C. M., p. 43–45, well de-

which *three* were most numerous and influential ; namely, the *Pharisees*, the *Sadducees*, and the *Essenes*. The two first are often mentioned in the Scriptures : but for a knowledge of the *Essenes* we are indebted to *Josephus*,

serve insertion here. They are as follows. "To vindicate my assertion, that *Epiphanius*' account of the Jewish sects, in the beginning of his book *de Hæresibus*, is not, probably, altogether untrue, I will offer a conjecture, which, the more I consider it, the more important it appears. I propose it for the consideration of the learned. It may, perhaps, serve to remove some obscurities from ancient ecclesiastical history. *Epiphanius* states, that there was among the Jews a sect of *Hemerobaptists*, who had this peculiarity, that they washed themselves daily. The same sect is mentioned by an ancient writer, *Hegesippus*, quoted by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., cap. 22, and by *Justin Martyr*, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, p. 245, ed. Jebb., though the latter abridges the name, calling them *Baptists*. Nor is this sect omitted in the Index of Heresies falsely ascribed to *Jerome*. The author of the *Clementina*, *homil. ii.*, c. 23, says, the founder of the sect was named *John*, and had twelve apostles and thirty chief men to aid him. The same account occurs in the *Epitome gestorum Petri*, § 26, which is subjoined to the *Clementina*. Either no credit is due to any ancient history, or these numerous and very ancient witnesses, who cannot be suspected of fraud or ignorance, must be believed when they assert that there was a sect among the Jews called *Hemerobaptists*. *Epiphanius*' whole story, therefore, is not to be accounted fabulous.

"The descendants of these *Hemerobaptists*, I suspect, are still existing. The learned well know, that there is in Persia and India, a numerous and widespread community, who call themselves *Mendai Ijahi*, *Disciples of John*. The Europeans call them *Christians of St. John*, because they have some slight knowledge of Christ. By the Oriental writers they are called *Sabbi* or *Sabbiin*. Concerning them, *Ignatius a Jesu*, a Carmelite monk who lived long among them, has written a book, entitled *Narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum S. Johannis*, &c. Rome, 1652, 8vo. It is no contemptible performance, and contains many things deserving attention, though it is ill digested and unpolished in its style. Besides this *Ignatius*, *Bart. Herbelot* (in *Biblioth. Orient. voce Sabi*), *Asseman* (*Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vat.*), *Theracot* and *Tavernier* (in their Travels), *Engelb. Kampfer* (*Amœnitatt. exot.*, fasc. ii., cap. 11), and very recently, *Fourmont* (*Hist. of Paris. Acad. of Inscriptions*), and others, have

written largely concerning this people. *Th. Sig. Bayer* proposed writing a book respecting them, which, perhaps, was unfinished at his death. The origin and true character of this sect are still unsettled. That they cannot be classed among Christians, is now clear. For what they know of Christ they have learned from the Chaldean Christians, among whom many of them live ; nor do they worship or honour Christ. Most of the moderns incline to regard them as descended from those *Sabians*, who are so often mentioned in the Koran of Mohammed, and by Maimonides. But their customs and their doctrines are wholly different from those attributed to the *Sabians* ; and from their being called *Sabians* by the Mohammedans, nothing can be inferred, because it is well known that the Arabians apply this name to all who reject their religion.

"I am inclined to look upon these *Christians of St. John*, as descendants of those *Hemerobaptists* who were a Jewish sect about the time of Christ. For this opinion I offer the following arguments : *First*, they profess to be Jews ; and say, their ancestors lived on the banks of the Jordan, whence they were driven by the Mohammedans. This argument I consider as overthrowing the hypothesis which makes them to be *Sabians*. *Secondly*, they place their dependence for pardon and salvation on their frequent bodily ablutions ; which was also the distinguishing error of the *Hemerobaptists*. At this day the *Disciples of John*, as they call themselves, are solemnly baptized by their priests but once a year ; whereas the *Hemerobaptists* daily purified themselves with water. But it is a fixed principle with them all to this day, that, the oftener they baptize, the holier and more happy they are ; and they therefore would all receive baptism every month, nay, every day, if they could. The avarice of their priests, who will not baptize them without a fee, has rendered the repetition of the rite less frequent. *Thirdly*, the founder of this sect, like that of the *Hemerobaptists*, was named *John* ; and he has left a book, which is preserved with reverence as being divine. It is commonly supposed, that this John was John the Baptist, Christ's forerunner mentioned in the Scriptures. Hence many conclude, that the *Sabians* are descended from the disciples of John the Baptist. So thought *Ignatius a Jesu* ; *Narratio de Chr. St. Johan.*, &c., cap. ii., p. 13, &c. But what this sect relate of their John, as stated by Ignatius himself,

Philo, and others. These principal sects agreed, indeed, respecting the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion; and yet, respecting questions of the highest importance, and such as relate to the salvation of the soul, they were engaged in endless contentions. The pernicious effects of these dissensions of the learned on the common people may be easily conceived.

§ 7. They disagreed, first respecting the *law* itself, or the rule which God had given them. The *Pharisees* superadded to the *written* law an *oral* or *unwritten* law, handed down by tradition, which both the *Sadducees* and the *Essenes* rejected, adhering only to the written law. They differed also respecting the *import of the law*. For the Pharisees held to a *double sense* of the Scriptures, the one obvious and *literal*, the other recondite and *figurative*, while the *Sadducees* held only to the literal sense of the Bible. Many of the *Essenes*, dissenting from both, maintained that the *words* of the law are of no authority, but that the *things* expressed by them are imagery, indicative of sacred and divine things. To these contests concerning the law, were added others on subjects of the highest moment, and particularly respecting the punishments and rewards announced in the law. The Pharisees supposed them to affect both the body and the soul, and to extend beyond the present life, while the Sadducees held to no future retributions. The Essenes took a middle course, admitting future rewards and punishments, but confining them to the soul. The body they held to be a malignant substance, and the temporary prison of the soul. (8)

§ 8. Notwithstanding these sects contended about points of such vast moment, it does not appear that they resorted to religious persecution of each other. Yet this forbearance and moderation, no one acquainted with

clearly show him to be diverse from the *Baptist*. For they deny, that their *John* suffered death under *Herod*; they say, he died a natural death in a town of Persia, called *Sciuster*, and was buried in the adjacent fields of that town. They state also, that he had a wife and four children. Only a few of the things they relate of their *John*, accord with what our Scriptures relate of *John the Baptist*; and these few things, like what they also say of Christ, they doubtless learned from those Christians with whom they associated to avoid the oppressions of the Mohammedans; and finding these things not inconsistent with their faith, and being unable, from their extreme ignorance, to refute them, they embraced and still retain them. What degree of weight this supposition of mine deserves, will better appear when the sacred books of this people, and especially the book said to be written by their founder *John*, shall be published. These were, a few years since, introduced into the king's library at Paris; so that we may hope the learned will sooner or later have access to them." These sacred books of the *Sabians* of *Hedshar* in Persia, have been examined with considerable care; see, among others, *M. Norberg*, *de religione et ling. Sabæorum*, in *Com. So-*

ciet. reg. scient., Gotting., 1780. The most probable conclusion is, that these people are not to be classed among either Jews, Christians, or Mohammedans; but are of uncertain origin, and have a religion of their own, compounded of Judaism, Christianity, Paganism, and Islamism. For a list of the writers who treat of them, see *Nössel's Anweisung*, &c., § 474, and *Stäudlin's kirchl. Geographie*, vol. ii., p. 705. See also *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, b. i., abt. ii., § 646, note 2; and *Gieseler's Text-book of Eccl. Hist.*, translated by Cunningham, Boston, 1836, vol. i., p. 40, note 4; and the *Art. Sabier*, in the *Conversations-Lexicon—Tr.*

(8) [For an account of the three Jewish sects, see *Ja. Trigland*, *Syntagma Trium Scriptorum illustrium* (viz., *Jo. Scaliger*, *Joh. Drusius*, and *Nicol. Serarius*), de *Judeorum Sectis*. Delft, 1702, 2 vols. 4to. After these, *Ja. Basnage* and *Hum. Prideaux* (in their Jewish histories), the authors of *Introductions* to the books of the N. Test. (and of works on Jewish Antiquities), and many others, have described these sects, some more and some less successfully. *Mosheim*, de *Reb. Christianor.* ante *C. M.*, p. 46.—See also *Jost's Algem. Gesch.* p. Israhel. Volkes, vol. i., p. 517, &c.—*Tr.*]

the history of those times will ascribe to noble and generous principles. The Sadducees were supported by the leading men of the nation, and the Pharisees by the common people, and, of course, neither sect could rise up in hostility against the other without the most imminent hazard. Besides, on the least appearance of tumult or sedition, the Romans would doubtless have punished the ringleaders with severity. We may add that the Sadducees were of accommodating, gentlemanly manners, and, from the principles of their sect, were averse from all broils and altercations.(9)

§ 9. The *Essenes* could more easily avoid contention with the other sects, because they lived, for the most part, in retired places, and remote from intercourse with mankind. They were scattered over Syria, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries; and, holding religion to consist in silence and meditation, they endeavoured, by a strict mode of life, and by various observances, borrowed probably from the Egyptians,(10) to raise themselves to higher degrees of virtue. They were not all, however, of the same sentiments. Some lived in celibacy, and made it their care to instruct and educate the children of others. Others married wives; not to gratify their natural propensities, but solely to propagate the human race.(11) Those living in Syria held that God may be propitiated by sacrifices, yet they believed that they must be offered in a manner very different from the common mode among the Jews: hence it appears that *they* did not reject the *literal sense* of the Mosaic law. But those who inhabited the deserts of Egypt maintained that no sacrifice should be presented to God, except that of a composed mind, absorbed in the contemplation of divine things; which shows that *they* put an *allegorical sense* upon the whole Jewish law.(12)

§ 10. The *Therapeutæ*, of whom *Philo* wrote a whole book,(13) are commonly reckoned a branch of the *Essene* family; whence the well-known distinction of *practical* and *theoretical* Essenes. But whether this classification is correct, may be doubted. For nothing is discoverable in the customs or institutions of the *Therapeutæ* which evinces absolutely that they were a branch of the Essenes; nor has *Philo* so represented them. Who can deny, that other fanatical Jews besides Essenes may have united together and formed a society? But I agree entirely with those who regard the *Therapeutæ* as being Jews who claimed to be true disciples of Moses, and as being neither Christians nor Egyptians. In reality, they were wild and melancholy enthusiasts, who led a life incongruous alike with the law of Moses and with sober reason.(14)

(9) [See Commentt. de Reb. Chr. ante C. M., p. 48, where Dr. M. proves from *Josephus* (Antiq. Jud., l. xviii., c. 1, and l. xiii., c. 10) that the Sadducees were all men of wealth; and (from his Bell. Jud., l. ii., c. 8) that they had little sympathy for others. Dr. M. thinks he finds the picture of a Sadducee in the rich man described in Luke xvi., 19. —*Schl.*]

(10) See *Lu. Holstenius*, Notes on Porphyry, de Vita Pythagoræ, p. 11, ed. Kuster.

(11) [See *Josephus*, de Bello Jud., lib. ii., c. 8, § 13. —*Schl.*]

(12) [See *Mosheim's* note on *Cudworth's*

Essay, de Vera notione coenæ Domini, p. 4, subjoined to his Intellectual System.]

(13) *Philo*, de Vita contemplativa, in his works, p. 889.

(14) The principal writers concerning the *Therapeutæ* are mentioned by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Salutar. Evang. toti orbi exor, cap. iv., p. 55. [The more ample account of the *Therapeutæ*, given by Dr. *Mosheim* in his Commentt. de Reb. Chr., &c., p. 55, &c., is thus abridged by *Schlegel*. "The *Therapeutæ* wished to pass for disciples of Moses, notwithstanding their wide departure from him. They gave up all their property, and

§ 11. It was not possible that any one of these sects should inculcate and diffuse the true principles of virtue and piety. The *Pharisees*, as our Saviour often laid to their charge, disregarded internal purity; and by a vain ostentation and an austere life, sought for popular applause; and also ascribed more authority to their vain traditions, than to the holy commandments of God, Matt. xxiii., 13, &c. The *Sadducees* gave a stimulus to iniquity, and to every lust, by discarding all future rewards and punishments. The *Essenes*, a fanatic and superstitious tribe, made piety to consist in a holy indolence and a dislike of mankind; and thus they sundered the ties of society.

§ 12. When those who assumed the name and the prerogatives of *the wise* were involved in such darkness and such altercations, who can doubt that the religion and piety of the *common people* were in a low and debased state? They were sunk in deplorable ignorance of divine things, and they supposed that they rendered themselves acceptable to God by their attention to sacrifices, ablutions, and the other ceremonies prescribed by Moses. From this twofold source [the ignorance of the people and the blindness of their leaders] flowed those polluted morals and that profligate life which characterized the greater part of the Jews while Christ was among them. (15) Hence our Saviour compared *the people* to wandering sheep, who had no shepherd, Matt. x., 6; xv., 24; and *their teachers* to blind men, who attempt to show others the way when they cannot see it themselves, Matt. xv., 14; John ix., 39.

betook themselves to retired situations, where they lived in solitary huts, without sacrifices, without any external worship, and without labour; mortifying their bodies by fasting and their souls by unceasing contemplation, in order to bring their heaven-born spirits, now imprisoned in bodies, into light and liberty, and fit them better for the celestial mansions after death. They assembled together every seventh day of the week, when, after hearing a discourse and offering prayers, they ate together, feeding on salt, and bread, and water. This meal was followed by a sacred dance, which they protracted through the night and till the dawn of day. At first the men and women danced apart; afterward, guided by inspiration, they danced together, and laboured by violent movements, outcries, songs, and voices, to express the love of God then working in their souls. Into such follies can human reason fall when it has mistaken notions of God and of human nature. It is still debated whether these Therapeutæ were Christians, or Jews, or heathen philosophers. *Eusebius* (Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 17) regarded them as Christian monks, established in Egypt by St. Mark; and many Romish writers, to support the high antiquity of monkery, zealously defend this opinion. The whole of this controversy may be seen in the *Lettres pour et contre la fameuse question, si les solitaires appelés Therapeutes, dont a parlé Philon le Juif, étoient Chrétiens*. Paris, 1712, 12mo.

The chief advocates of this opinion are *B. de Montfaucon*, in the Notes to his Fr. translation of *Philo*, and *M. le Quien*, *Christianus Oriens*, tom. ii., p. 332. On the other hand, *Scaliger*, *Chamier*, *Lightfoot*, *Duillé*, the two *Basnages*, *Pridcaux*, *Ittig*, *Buddeus*, *Mosheim*, *Baumgarten*, and recently *J. A. Orsi* (His. Eccles., vol. i., p. 77) and *Mangey* (Preface to Philo's Works) have maintained that they were *Jews*, and of the sect of *Essenes*. *J. J. Lange*, in a Dissert., published in 1721, maintained, upon very slender grounds, that they were *Oriental philosophers*, of melancholy temperament, who had imbibed some Jewish notions. And *Jablonsky*, in an Essay on the subject, makes them to be *Egyptian priests*, addicted to astrology and other sacred sciences of the Egyptians." Dr. Mosheim pertinently observes (Com. de Reb., &c., p. 50), "The Christian monks, who evidently originated in Egypt, borrowed their peculiarities from the *practical Essenes*; for nothing can be more similar than the rules and regulations of the ancient monks and those of the *Essenes*, as described by Josephus. On the other hand, the Christian *solitaries*, called *Eremites*, copied after the *theoretical Essenes*, or *Therapeutæ*."—*Tr.*

(15) [A striking passage relative to the vicious lives of the Jews, in our Saviour's time, occurs in *Josephus*, Bell. Jud., lib. v., c. 13, § 6.—*Schl.*]

§ 13. To all these stains on the character of the Jews in the time of Christ's advent, must be added the attachment of many to the Oriental philosophy, in regard to the origin of the world, and to the indubitable offspring of that philosophy, the *Kabbala*. That many Jews *were* infected with this system is placed beyond all doubt, both by the sacred books of the New Testament and by the early history of the Christian church.(16) It is certain that the founders of several of the *Gnostic* sects were Jews. And the followers of such systems of philosophy must have differed widely from the other Jews, in their views of the God of the Old Testament, and in their views of Moses, of the creation, and of the Messiah. For they held the world's creator to be a different being from the supreme God, and that his domination over the human race was to be destroyed by the Messiah. From such opinions would originate a monstrous system, widely different from the genuine religion of the Jews.

§ 14. The outward *forms* of worship established by Moses were less corrupted than the other parts of religion. Yet men of the greatest learning have observed that various rites were introduced into the temple itself, which we search for in vain in the divine ritual. It appears that the Jews, on becoming acquainted with the sacred rites of the neighbouring nations, and with those of the Greeks and Romans, were so captivated with a number of the ceremonies practised in idol worship, that they did not hesitate to adopt them, and to superadd them as ornamental to the rites of God's appointment.(17.)

§ 15. For this great corruption of a nation, which God had selected for his peculiar people, various *causes* may be assigned. In the first place, their fathers had brought back with them from Chaldea and the adjacent countries, and had introduced into Palestine, many foolish and vain opinions wholly unknown to the founders of the nation.(18) And from the time of the conquest of Asia by *Alexander* the Great the customs and dogmas of the Greeks were disseminated among the Persians, the Syrians, the Arabians, and likewise among the Jews, who before were rude in letters and philosophy.(19) The excursions, also, which many Jews were accustomed to make into the neighbouring countries, especially into Egypt and Phœnicia, in pursuit of wealth, caused various errors and fancies of the pagan nations to spread among the Hebrews. And lastly, *Herod* the Great and his sons, and likewise the Roman procurators and soldiers, undoubtedly planted in the country many foreign institutions and pollutions. Other causes will readily occur to those acquainted with the Jewish history after the times of the Maccabees.

§ 16. But, notwithstanding their numerous faults, the people generally manifested the strongest attachment to the law of Moses, and were very careful of its honour and authority. Hence they erected throughout the country houses of worship, with the Greek appellation of *Synagogues*; in which the people assembled for prayer, and to listen to the public expounders of the law. Schools also were established in the principal

(16) See *J. C. Wolf*, Biblioth. Ebraica, vol. ii., l. vii., c. i., § 9, p. 206.

(17) See *John Spencer*, de Legibus ritual. veter. Ebræorum, tom. ii., lib. iv., where he treats particularly of Jewish rites borrowed from the Gentiles and not to be found in the law of God.

(18) See *Tho. Gale*, on *Jamblichus* de mysteriis Aegyptiorum, p. 206. Nor does *Josephus* conceal this fact, Antiq. Jud., l. iii., c. 7, § 2.

(19) [*Le Clerc*, Epist. crit. ix., p. 250. —*Schl.*]

towns, where literary men instructed the youth in both divine and human knowledge.(20) That these institutions had considerable influence to preserve the law inviolate, and to check in some degree the progress of wickedness, no one can hesitate to believe.

§ 17. The *Samaritans*, who worshipped on Mount *Gerizim*, and who lived in virulent hostility with their neighbours the Jews, were equally oppressed, and were, in an equal degree, the authors of their own calamities. It appears, from the history of those times, that the Samaritans suffered as much as the Jews from the machinations of factious and unprincipled men; although they had, perhaps, not so many religious sects. That their religion was less pure than the Jewish, Christ himself has testified, John iv., 22. And yet they seem to have had more correct views of the offices of the Messiah than the mass of the Jews had, John iv., 25. Though we are not to believe all that the Jews have said respecting their opinions, yet it is undeniable, that the Samaritans adulterated the pure doctrines of the Old Testament with profane mixtures of pagan errors.(21)

§ 18. The narrow limits of Palestine could not contain the very numerous nation of the Jews. Hence, when our Saviour was born, there was almost no considerable province which did not contain a large number of Jews, who employed themselves in traffic and the mechanic arts. These Jews, in the countries beyond Palestine, were protected against the violence and abuse of the inhabitants by the public laws, and by the injunctions of the magistrates.(22) Yet they were in most places exceedingly odious to the mass of people, on account of their singularity as to religion and customs. The special providence of God is undoubtedly to be recognised in the dispersion of this people (who were the depositaries of the true religion, that which inculcates the worship of the one God) over nearly the whole world, so that their example might put superstition to shame, and in some measure prepare the way for the Christian religion.

(20) See *Camp. Vitringa*, de Synagoga Vetere, l. iii., c. v., and l. i., c. v., vii. [*Prideaux*, *Connexions*, &c., pt. i., b. vi., anno 445.—*Tr.*]

(21) The principal writers concerning the Samaritans are enumerated by *J. G. Carpzov*, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, pt. ii., cap. vi., p. 595. [The most valuable are *Chr. Cellarius*, *Hist. gentis Samarit.*, in his *Diss. Acad.*, p. 109, &c. *John Morin*, *Antiq. eccl. orient.* *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. ii., lib. ii., c. 1–13. *H. Reland*, *de Samaritanis*, in his *Diss. Miscell.*, pt. ii., (*H. Prideaux*, *Connexions*), and *Baumgar-*

ten, *Geschichte der Religionspart.*, p. 274, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) See *Ja. Gronovius*, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judæis, ad cultum divinum per Asiae Minoris urbes secure obeundum*. Lugd. Bat., 1712, 8vo. [For a candid and faithful account of the state of the Jews, both in Palestine and out of it, the English reader is referred to *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History*, pt. i., vol. i., ch. ii.–vi. See also *J. M. Jost's* *Algem. Gesch. des Israelit. Volke.*, b. viii., vol. ii., p. 1, &c., Berlin, 1832.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST.

§ 1. The Birth of Christ.—§ 2. His Childhood and Youth.—§ 3. His Precursor, John B.—
 § 4. His subsequent Life.—§ 5. He appoints twelve Apostles, and seventy Disciples.—
 § 6. Reason of this Number.—§ 7. Fame of Christ out of Judea.—§ 8. Success of his
 Ministry.—§ 9. His Death.—§ 10. His Resurrection and Ascension to Heaven.

§ 1. So many and so virulent diseases of the human race demanded the aid of a divine physician. Therefore the Son of God himself descended from heaven upon Palestine, in the close of the reign of *Herod the Great*; and joining himself to human nature, he showed himself to mortals, a teacher that cannot err, and at once their sponsor at the court of Heaven and their king. In what *year* this salutary light rose upon the world, the most persevering efforts of the learned have not been able fully to ascertain. Nor will this surprise us, if we consider that the earliest Christians knew not the *day* of their Saviour's birth, and judged differently on the subject.(1) But of what consequence is it that we know not the year or day when this light

(1) Most of the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, are collected by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliographia Antiquar.*, cap. vii., § ix., p. 187.

[Respecting the year of Christ's birth, the inquisitive reader is remitted to the elaborate chronologists, *Scaliger*, *Petavius*, *Usher*, &c., and to the more voluminous eccles. historians, *Natalis Alexander*, *Pagi*, &c. But, not to leave the common reader wholly uninformed on the subject, a few general observations will here be made. The birth of Christ was first made an era, from which to reckon dates, by *Dionysius Exiguus*, about A.D. 532. He supposed Christ to have been born on the 25th December, in the year of Rome 753, *Lentulus* and *Piso* consuls. And this computation has been followed, in practice, to this day; notwithstanding the learned are well agreed that it must be incorrect. To ascertain the true time of Christ's birth, there are *two principal data* afforded by the evangelists. I. It is clear, from *Matth. ii.*, 1, &c., that Christ was born *before* the death of *Herod the Great*, who died about Easter, in the year of Rome 749 or 750. (*Lardner*, *Credibil.*, pt. i., vol. ii., appendix.) Now, if Christ was born in the December next before *Herod's* death, it must have been in the year of Rome 748 or 749; and, of course, four, if not five, years anterior to the Dionysian or vulgar era. II. It is probable, from *Lu. iii.*, 1, 2, 23, that Jesus was about thirty years of age in the

fifteenth year of the reign of *Tiberius Cæsar*. Now the reign of *Tiberius* may be considered as commencing at the time he became sole emperor, in August of the year of Rome 767; or (as there is some reason to suppose that *Augustus* made him partner in the government *two years* before he died) we may begin his reign in the year of Rome 765. The 15th year of *Tiberius* will therefore be either the year of Rome 781 or 779. From which deduct 30, and we have the year of Rome 751 or 749 for the year of Christ's birth; the former *two*, and the latter *four years earlier* than the Dionysian computation. Comparing these results with those obtained from the death of *Herod*, it is generally supposed the true time of Christ's birth was the year of Rome 749, or four years before the vulgar era. But the conclusion is not certain, because there is uncertainty in the data. (1) It is not certain that we ought to reckon *Tiberius's* reign as beginning two years before the death of *Augustus*. (2) *Luke* says "*about thirty years of age*." This is indefinite, and may be understood of twenty-nine, thirty, or thirty-one years. (3) It is not certain in which of the two years mentioned *Herod* died; nor *how long* before that event the Saviour was born.—Respecting the *month* and *day* of Christ's birth, we are left almost wholly to conjecture. The disagreement of the early fathers, is evidence that the day was not celebrated as a festival in the apostolic times.—*Tr.*]

first shone, since we fully know that it *has* appeared, and that there is no obstacle to our enjoying its splendour and its warmth?

§ 2. An account of the birth, lineage, family, and parents of Christ, is left us by the four inspired writers who give the history of his life. But they say very little respecting his childhood and youth. When a young child he was rescued from the cruelty of Herod by the flight of the family into Egypt, Matthew ii., 13. When twelve years of age he disputed publicly in the temple with the most learned Jewish doctors upon religious subjects. Afterward, till he was thirty years of age, he lived with his parents as a dutiful and affectionate son, Luke ii., 51, 52. Divine wisdom has not seen fit to give us more particulars; nor is it certain, though many think it so, that Christ worked at the trade of his foster-father, *Joseph*, who was a carpenter. Yet there were certain vain and deceitful persons in former times, who ventured to fill up this obscure part of our Saviour's life with extravagant and ridiculous fables.(2)

§ 3. In the thirtieth year of his age he entered on the offices for which he came into the world. To render his ministry more useful to the Jews, *John*, the son of a Jewish priest, a man grave and venerable in his whole manner of life, was commissioned of God to proclaim the advent of the *Messiah* who had been promised to the fathers. He called himself the *precursor* of the *Messiah*; and being full of holy zeal, he exhorted the Jews to amend their lives and purify their hearts, and thus prepare themselves for the coming, or, rather, for the actual presence of the Son of God; and those who professed repentance and reformation, he initiated in the approaching kingdom of the Saviour, by immersion in the Jordan, Matthew iii., 2, &c.; John i., 22, &c. *Jesus* himself, before commencing his public ministry, chose to receive a solemn lustration in the waters of Jordan at the hands of *John*; in order, as he tells us, that he might not appear to neglect any part of the Jewish law and religion.(3)

§ 4. It is not necessary to enter here into a particular detail of the life and actions of *Jesus Christ*. All Christians know that for more than three years, amid great trials and afflictions, and surrounded by snares and perils, he instructed the Jewish people in the counsels and purposes of the Most High; that he omitted nothing that could allure both the ignorant multitude and the well informed; that he led a life so spotless and holy, that no suspicion whatever could attach to him; and that, by stupendous miracles of a salutary and beneficial character, and such as accorded with the nature of his mission, he placed the truth of the religion he taught beyond all controversy.

§ 5. As this religion was to be propagated throughout the world, it was necessary for him to select some persons to be his constant companions and intimates; who should be able to state and testify to posterity and to the re-

(2) See a collection of these fables by *J. A. Fabricius*, Cod. Apoc. N. T., tom. i. [The works here referred to, are the Gospel of the nativity of Mary; the Previous Gospel, ascribed to *James the Just*; the Gospel of the infancy of Christ, ascribed to *Thomas*; the Gospel of the Infancy, &c., translated from the Arabic; all of which are stuffed with marvellous tales of miracles and prodigies, fit only to amuse the ignorant and superstitious.—*Tr.*]

(3) [See, concerning *John the Baptist*, *Chr. Cellarius*, two Diss. de Vita, carcere et supplicio Jo. Bapt. in his Diss. Acad., pt. i., p. 169, and pt. ii., p. 373. *Tho. Ittig*, *Historiæ eccles. Imi. Sæculi Selecta Capita*, cap. 8, sect. 4, and *Witsius*, *Miscell. Sacra*, tom. ii., p. 464, &c.—*Schl.* Also *G. B. Winer*, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, Article *Johannes*.—*Tr.*]

most nations, with the greatest assurance and authority, the events of his life, his miracles, and his whole system of doctrine. Therefore, from the Jews about him, he chose twelve messengers whom he distinguished from others by the title of *Apostles*. They were plebeians, poor, and illiterate; for he would not employ the rich, the eloquent, and the learned, lest the success of their mission should be ascribed to natural causes and to human means, 1 Corinthians i., 21. These he once sent forth among the Jews during his lifetime, Matthew x., 7; but afterward he retained them constantly near him, that they might witness all that he said or did. (4) But, that the people might not lack religious instruction, he commissioned seventy other disciples to travel at large through Judea, Luke x., 1.

§ 6. The learned have inquired, why the Saviour appointed just *twelve*, neither more nor less, to be apostles, and just *seventy* to be disciples; and various conjectures are offered on the subject. But it being manifest from the words of *Christ* himself, Matthew xix., 28; Luke xxii., 30, that the number of the apostles had reference to the number of the tribes of Israel, there can scarcely be a doubt that he wished to indicate to the Jews that he was the supreme Lord and Pontiff over the whole Hebrew race, which was divided into twelve tribes. The seventy disciples were just equal in number to the senators composing the Sanhedrim or the grand council of the nation; and this justifies the conjecture that *Christ* intended by the choice of the *seventy*, to admonish the Jews that the authority of their Sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power in religious matters was vested in him alone. (5)

§ 7. Jesus himself gave instruction to none but Jews; nor did he allow his disciples to travel among other nations as teachers while he continued on earth, Matthew x., 5, 6; xv., 24. Yet the extraordinary deeds he performed leave us no room to doubt, that his fame very early extended to other nations. There are respectable writers who state that *Abgarus*, king of Edessa, being dangerously sick, sent a letter to *Christ* imploring

(4) [Dr. *Mosheim* has a long note in the parallel passage of his *Comment. de Rebus Chr. ante C. M.*, p. 49, the substance of which is this: The title *Apostles* was given to those principal men whom the high priests retained as their private counselors, and whom they occasionally sent as their legates to the foreign Jews, either to collect the yearly tax for the temple or to execute other commissions. We have not, indeed, a direct testimony at hand, proving that the title of *apostles* was given to such legates of the high priests in the days of *Christ*. Yet there is intimation of this in Gal. i., 1, and *Jerome* so understood the passage. See his *Comment.*, &c., Opp., tom. ix., p. 124. And that after the destruction of Jerusalem, the legates of the Jewish *patriarchs* (who stood in the place of high priests) were called apostles, is fully proved. See *Jerome*, ubi supra, and *Eusebius* on Isa., ch. xviii., 2. See also *Ja. Gothofred* on Cod. Theodos., tom. vi., p. 251, ed. Ritter. *Dion. Petavius*, on Epiph-

an. ad Hæres., xxx. *P. Wesseling*, de Archontibus Jud., p. 91. *Walch* (of Göttingen), Hist. Patriarch. Jud., and *Suicer*, Thesaur. Eccles., tom. i., p. 477.—*Tr.*]

(5) [There are two factitious lists of the seventy disciples now extant, which are falsely ascribed to *Hippolytus* and to *Doritheus*. They may be seen in various works; e. g., *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang., &c., p. 115–118, and annexed to the books de Vita et morte Mosis, ed. Fabricius; and in *T. Ittig*, Hist. eccles. Imi Saecul., p. 472. That no sort of credit is due to them, is shown by *Ittig*, ubi supra; by *D. Blondell*, de Episcopis et Presbyt., p. 93, and by others. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., i., 12, expressly declares that no catalogue of the seventy disciples was to be found any where in his day. The two lists nearly agree; and they are evidently made up by collecting together, without the least judgment, nearly all the names of Christians mentioned in the N. Testament, and particularly those in the salutations of Paul. —*Tr.*]

his assistance, and that Christ not only wrote an answer to the king, but also sent him his picture.(6) It is the prevailing opinion that not only the letters of *Christ* and *Abgarus*, but likewise the whole story, are a fabrication.(7) And I would by no means take upon me to support the credit of the letters; yet I see no very weighty reason for rejecting altogether the whole story.

§ 8. The numerous proofs of the divine authority of Christ, induced very many of the Jews to revere him as the Son of God: but the leading men, especially the Pharisees and the chief priests, whose vices and crimes he freely reprov'd, plotted against his life; because they were fearful of losing their honours and privileges, if *Christ* should continue publicly to teach. For a long time the machinations of these ungodly men were ineffectual. But at last, his ungrateful disciple, *Judas*, disclosing the place of his master's nocturnal retirement, he was seized by soldiers at the command of the Sanhedrim, and ordered to be tried for his life.

§ 9. He was first arraigned before the Jewish high priest and senate, where he was accused of having violated the law, and blasphemed the majesty of God. Thence he was dragged to the tribunal of *Pilate*, the Roman procurator; and there accused of sedition, and of treason against Cæsar. Neither of these accusations could have satisfied fair and upright judges. But the clamours of the people, which were instigated by the irreligious priests, compelled *Pilate*, though reluctantly, to pass sentence of death upon him. As he had come into our world to make expiation for the sins of men, and as he knew that all the objects of his abode among men were accomplished, he voluntarily submitted to be nailed to a cross, on which he yielded up his spotless soul to God.

§ 10. On the third day after his burial he reassumed that life which he had voluntarily laid down; and by showing himself alive, he made it manifest that man is no longer insolvent to divine justice. He now continued forty days with his disciples, employing the time very much in giving them instruction. To his enemies he would not show himself visibly; among other reasons, because he knew that those unprincipled men, who had before accused him of sorcery, would impudently affirm that it was only a spectre that appeared, bearing his likeness, and produced by the power of the devil. At length he ascended up to heaven in the full view of his disciples, after commissioning them to preach the Gospel to all nations.

(6) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 13. [Here is the earliest notice of these *Letters*. For the earliest history of the *picture*, see *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 27. See the *Letters* themselves, with notes, in] *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex Apocryphus N. Test., tom. i., p. 317.

(7) See *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. i., c. 18, p. 500. *Theoph. Sigf. Bayer*,

Historia Edessena et Osroëna, l. iii., p. 104. *J. S. Asseman*, Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat., tom. i., p. 554. ["As to the *picture*, which is still preserved, and shown at Rome, *Is. Beausobre* has fully exposed the fable, in his Dis. des Images de main divine; in the Biblioth. Germanique, tom. xviii., p. 10," &c. *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 73.]

CHAPTER IV.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Effusion of the H. Spirit on the Apostles.—§ 2. They preach to Jews and Samaritans.—§ 3. Election of a new Apostle.—§ 4. Paul's Conversion.—§ 5. Attention to the Poor, and a Community of Goods, in the Church.—§ 6. Many Churches planted by the Apostles.—§ 7. Respect for Christ among the Pagans.—§ 8. Causes of the rapid Progress of Christianity.—§ 9. Extraordinary Gifts of the early Christians.—§ 10. Fictitious Causes assigned for the Progress of Christianity.

§ 1. WHEN *Jesus* was seated at the right hand of the Eternal Father, the first proof he gave of his majesty and power was on the fiftieth day(1) after his death, by the effusion of the Holy Spirit upon his disciples and friends on earth, Acts ii., 1, &c. On receiving this celestial gift and teacher, they were freed from all their former ignorance and blindness of mind, and endued with astonishing alacrity and power to fulfil the duties of their office. With these mental endowments was joined the knowledge of various foreign languages, which was indispensable to them in giving instruction to different nations; and also a firm reliance on the promise of *Christ*, that God would aid them as often as should be necessary by miracles.(2)

§ 2. Relying on these divine aids, the disciples, in accordance with the Saviour's injunctions (Luke xxiv., 47; Acts i., 8; xiii., 46), first laboured to bring the Jews to subject themselves to *Christ*. Nor was this labour without effect, for many thousands of them soon became Christians, Acts ii., 41; iv., 4. Next they proceeded to the Samaritans, which also accorded with their instructions, Acts i., 8. And here, too, they gathered a Christian church, Acts viii., 14. Lastly, after spending many years at Jerusalem, and regulating and confirming the churches of Christ in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they travelled abroad among various nations, and their labours were everywhere attended with the greatest success.(3)

§ 3. The first care of the apostles after the Saviour's ascension, was to complete the number of twelve apostles established by *Christ*, by electing

(1) [From the terms here used by Dr. Mosheim, it would seem that he supposed the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, took place on the Jewish Sabbath, or *Saturday*, and not on *Sunday*, as many have supposed.—*Tr.*]

(2) [In his Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M., p. 76, Dr. Mosheim states, that he does not account the *power of working miracles* among the supernatural gifts, because such power neither was, nor could be, conferred on men, Omnipotence alone being able to work miracles; so that *faith* to pray for them, and to expect them, at the hands of God, was all that the H. Ghost actually imparted to the Apostles.—*Tr.*]

(3) [It appears from the book of *Acts*, that the apostles, or, at least, most of them, remained in and near Jerusalem for several years after the ascension; but *how long* they continued together is uncertain. There was anciently a tradition, which *Eusebius* states (Hist. Eccles., v. 18) on the authority of *Apollonius*, a writer of the second century, as does *Clemens Alex.* (Strom. vi., c. 5) from a spurious work, *Predicatio Petri*, that the Saviour enjoined upon his apostles not to leave Jerusalem till *twelve years* after his ascension. *About* so long they probably continued there; and their being divinely guided in most of their movements might give rise to the tradition.—*Tr.*]

a more worthy person to the place of Judas, who had laid violent hands on himself. Therefore, the little company of *Christ's* servants at Jerusalem being assembled, two men, the most noted for their piety and faith in *Christ*, *Barsabas* and *Matthias*, were proposed as the most worthy of that office. One of these, *Matthias*, being designated by lot—as it is commonly supposed, or elected by the major vote of all the persons present, was constituted the twelfth apostle, Acts i., 15, &c.(4)

§ 4. As these twelve ambassadors of *Christ* were all of them plain, illiterate men, and as the Christian community, now in its infancy, needed a man who could attack and vanquish the Jewish doctors and the pagan philosophers with their own weapons, *Jesus Christ* himself, by a voice from heaven, soon after appointed a thirteenth apostle; namely, *Saul*, who afterward assumed the name of *Paul*, a man who had been a most virulent enemy of the Christians, but who was well skilled in the Jewish learning, and not ignorant of the Grecian, Acts ix., 1, &c. To this truly admirable man, whether we consider his courage, his force of mind, or his patience and perseverance in trials and labours—how much the Christian world is indebted, is manifest from the *Acts of the Apostles* and from his own *Epistles*.

§ 5. The first of all the Christian churches founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem; and after the form and model of this, all the others of that age were constituted. That church, however, was governed immediately by the apostles; to whom the *presbyters* and the *deacons* or overseers of the poor were subject. Though the people had not withdrawn themselves from the Jewish worship, yet they held their own separate meetings; in which they were instructed by the apostles and presbyters, offered up their united prayers, celebrated in the sacred supper the memorial of *Jesus Christ*, of his death, and the salvation he procured, and afterward manifested their mutual love, partly by their liberality to the poor, and partly by those temperate repasts, which from their design were called *love-feasts*, Acts ii., 42.(5) Among the virtues for which this primitive church of Christ was distinguished, the care of the poor and needy is most conspicuous. For the rich liberally supplied the wants of all the brotherhood, and with such promptitude and tenderness that, *Luke* says, *they had all things common*, Acts ii., 44; iv., 32. But it is manifest from the expressions used by *Peter* in Acts v., 4, as well as from other considerations, that the declaration of *Luke* should not be understood, as it generally has been, of their *possessing* in common, but only of their *using* in common.(6)

(4) [Dr. Mosheim has a long note in the parallel place in his Comment. de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 78–80, in which he aims to prove that ἐδωκαν κλήρον αὐτῶν, in Acts i., 26, signifies *they gave their votes*; and not, as it is commonly understood, *they cast their lots*. But his interpretation is very generally rejected.—Tr.]

(5) [Dr. Mosheim understood Acts ii., 42, as descriptive of the several parts of the *ordinary public worship* of these primitive Christians, rather than of their *Christian character and conduct in general*. See his Comment. de Rebus Christianorum ante

C. Mag., 113–116. If Mosheim's interpretation of that *text* is erroneous, as most interpreters think it is, this account of the mode of worship in the apostolic church rests on a slender basis.—Tr.]

(6) [“It is an ancient opinion, though not older than the fourth century, that in the church of Jerusalem there was such a *community of goods*, as existed among the ancient Essenes, and afterward among the monks. But this opinion is destitute of any solid foundation, resting solely on the declaration of *Luke*, that they had all things common. See my Diss. de Vera natura com-

§ 6. The ambassadors of Christ on leaving Jerusalem travelled over a great part of the world, and in a short time collected numerous religious societies in various countries. Of the churches they founded, not a small number is mentioned in the sacred books, especially in the *Acts* of the Apostles. (7) Besides these, there can be no doubt they collected many others, both by their own efforts and by the efforts of their followers. But how far they travelled, what nations they visited, or when and where they died, is exceedingly dubious and uncertain. (8) The stories often told respecting their travels among the Gauls, the Britons, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Russians, are too recent and fantastic to be received by an inquisitive lover of the truth. (9) A great

munionis bonorum in Ecclesia Hierosolym., which is the first in the second volume of my Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccl. pertinentes."—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 118.]

(7) [The names of these churches are collected by *P. J. Hartmann*, de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis, cap. vii., p. 107; and by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorietis, cap. v., p. 83, &c.]

(8) ["It is a very ancient and current report, confirmed by many witnesses, that all the apostles suffered public martyrdom; with the exception of St. John, who died a natural death at Ephesus. And this opinion is so firmly believed, by many who would not be thought credulous, that to call it in question, is to run some hazard of being charged with slandering those holy men. Such as please, may believe the account; but let them not be offended if I declare the martyrdom of most of the apostles to be less certain than they suppose. That *Peter*, *Paul*, and *James* died violent deaths, I believe, on the testimony of the numerous ancient authors; but that the other apostles did so, I cannot feel so certain. As my first ground of doubt, a very ancient writer of the second century, *Heracleon*, a Valentinian indeed, but no contemptible man, cited by *Clemens Alex.*, Strom., l. iv., c. 9, denies that *Matthew*, *Philip*, *Thomas*, *Levi*, and others confessed Christ before magistrates, and were put to death for so doing. He is urging that the public confession of himself required by the Saviour, Matt. x., 32, may be made by a holy and Christian life, as well as by a public avowal before a persecuting magistrate; and he states as proof, Ὁν γὰρ πάντες οἱ σωζόμενοι ὁμολόγησαν τὴν διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὁμολογίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθον. Ἐξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Θωμᾶς, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, for not all that were saved, made that confession in words (before magistrates) and so died. Of this number was *Matthew*, *Philip*, *Thomas*, *Levi*, and many others. *Clement*, though he disapproves several things in the passage he quotes,

leaves this statement to stand as it is; which is proof that *he* had nothing to allege against it. *Philip* is expressly declared not to have suffered martyrdom, but to have died and been buried at Hierapolis; so says *Polycrates*, in his Epistle to Victor, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., v. 24. *Baronius* indeed, (Annals, A.D. 35, § 141), and after him many others maintain, that this was not *Philip the apostle*, but *Philip* one of the seven deacons of Jerusalem. But *Polycrates* says expressly, that he was one of the twelve apostles. A still stronger argument is, that all the writers of the three first centuries, and among them, such as contended for the high dignity of the martyrs in opposition to the Valentinians, viz., *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alex.*, and *Origen*, never mention but three of the apostles as being martyrs; namely, *Peter*, *Paul*, and *James* the elder. See *Tertullian*, Scorpiace, cap. xv. I am therefore led to believe, that the common reports respecting the sufferings of Christ's ambassadors were fabricated after the days of Constantine. And two causes might lead to such reports. (1) The extravagant estimation in which martyrdom was held, made it seem necessary to rank the apostles among the martyrs. (2) The ambiguity of the word *μάρτυρ*, martyr, which properly signifies a witness, in which sense Christ himself called his apostles *μάρτυρες* (Acts i., 8, see also Acts ii., 32), might lead the more ignorant to believe and to amplify these fables." *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. ante C. M., p. 81–84, abridged considerably.—*Tr.*]

(9) ["There is not one of the European nations that does not glory, in either an apostle or some one of the seventy disciples, or at least in some early saint commissioned by an apostle, as having come among them and collected a Christian church. The Spaniards say, that the apostles *Paul* and *James* the elder, with many of the seventy disciples and other assistants of the apostles, introduced the light of the gospel into their country. And a Spaniard would bring himself into trouble, if he should confront this opin-

part of these fabulous stories were got up after the days of *Charlemagne*; when most of the Christian churches contended as vehemently about the antiquity of their origin, as ever did the Arcadians, the Egyptians, or the Greeks.

ion. The *French* contend that *Crescens*, a disciple and companion of *Paul*, *Dionysius* the Athenian Areopagite, *Lazarus*, *Mary Magdalene*, &c., first brought their countrymen to profess Christ. Among the *Italians* there is scarcely a city which does not profess to have received the gospel and their first minister from *Paul* or *Peter*. See *P. Giannone*, *Histoire civile du royaume de Naples*, tom. i., p. 74, 75. And at this day, a man could not escape the charge of heresy, who should raise a question on this subject. See *J. Lamy*, *Deliciæ eruditorum*, tom. viii., Pref., and tom. xi., Preface. The *Germans* assert that *Maternus*, *Valerianus*, and many others were sent among them by the apostles; and that these legates of St. Peter and of the other apostles baptized a large number of persons. The *British* think that *St. Paul* (as they infer from *Clemens Rom.* first Epistle to the Corinthians), *Simon Zelotes*, *Aristobulus*, and especially *Joseph* of Arimathea, were the founders of their church. The *Russians*, *Poles*, and *Prussians*, honour *St. Andrew* as the founder of their churches. All this and much more passed for sober truth, so long as sacred and human learning lay buried in shades and darkness. But at this day the most learned and wise admit, that most of these stories were fabricated after the age of *Charlemagne*, by men who were ignorant or crafty, and eager to secure distinction to their churches. See *Aug. Calmet's* *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i., p. xxvi. *Le Beuf*, *Diss. sur l'histoire de France*, tom. i., p. 192, &c. *Jo. Launoï*, *Diss. qua locus Sulpitii Severi de primis Galliæ martyribus defenditur*, Opp., tom. ii., pt. i., p. 184. I commend these writers, yet cannot agree with them in dating the commencement of this foolish zeal for the antiquity of their churches, after the days of *Charlemagne*. It began much earlier. See *Gregory Turon.* de Gloria martyrum, cap. xii., p. 735." *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 84–86.—It must not be inferred, from what Dr. Mosheim says of the foolish pretensions of the modern European nations to a high Christian antiquity, that we are to reject all that the ancient fathers relate concerning the labours of the apostles after Christ's ascension. Dr. Mosheim was too judicious to do this. He says, ubi supra, p. 80, 81: "As to what we are told respecting the transactions of the apostles, their travels, miracles, and deaths, if we except what is gathered from the New

Test. and a few other ancient monuments, a large part is dubious and uncertain. Some things, however, have more credibility and verisimilitude than others. I would not reject all that is clearly attested by *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Paulinus*, *Jerome*, *Socrates*, and some other ancient writers quoted by Eusebius; but what is attested only by authors subsequent to these, or unknown, I would not readily believe, unless facts offer themselves to corroborate the testimony." Following these judicious rules of *Mosheim*, we may believe that *Peter*, after preaching long in Judea, and other parts of Syria, probably visited Babylon, Asia Minor, and finally Rome, where he was crucified. *Paul's* history is given in the Acts to about A.D. 64. He was probably released from captivity, visited Judea, Asia Minor, and Greece, and returning to Rome, was there beheaded about A.D. 67 or 68. *John* remained many years in Judea, and afterward removed to Ephesus, where he lived to a very advanced age, dying about A.D. 100. He was banished to Patmos about A.D. 95, and was greatly revered. *James* the elder, (brother of John) was put to death by Herod Agrippa, about A.D. 44, (Acts xii., 1). *James* the younger, the son of Alphaeus, spent his life in Judea, long presided over the church of Jerusalem, and there suffered martyrdom, a little before the destruction of Jerusalem. *Andrew* probably laboured on the shores of the Black Sea, near the modern Constantinople, and perhaps in Greece. *Philip*, either the apostle or the evangelist, is reported to have ended his days at Hierapolis, in Phrygia. *Thomas* seems to have travelled eastward, to Parthia, Media, Persia, and India. *Bartholomew* took perhaps a more southern course, and preached in Arabia. *Matthew* is also reported to have travelled east, in the modern Persia. Of *Simon* the Canaanite, nothing to be relied on can be said. *Thaddeus*, *Lebbeus*, or *Jude* the brother of James, the author of an epistle, is reported to have preached at Edessa, in the north of Syria. Of the companions of the apostles, *Timothy*, after accompanying Paul many years, is said to have been stationed at Ephesus, where he suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Nerva. *Titus*, another companion of Paul, is reported to have been stationed in Crete, where he died. *Mark*, or *John* surnamed Mark, attended Paul, and afterward Peter, and probably preached the gospel in Egypt. Of *Luke*,

§ 7. That many persons who were unwilling to adopt entirely the religion of Christ, were yet induced, by the fame of his deeds and the sublime purity of his doctrines, to rank him among men of the highest excellence, and even among the gods, is evinced by numerous documents. With great veneration many preserved pictures of Christ in their houses, and also the pictures of his apostles. (10) It is said that even a Roman emperor, viz., *Tiberius*, proposed to have *Christ* enrolled among the gods of the empire; but that the Senate rejected the proposal. Though many at the present day think this to be quite improbable, yet there are distinguished men who are led by weighty reasons to a different opinion. (11)

§ 8. The causes must have been divine which could enable men destitute of all human aid, poor and friendless, neither eloquent nor learned, fishermen and publicans, and they too *Jews*, that is, persons odious to all other nations, in so short a time to persuade a great part of mankind to abandon the religions of their fathers, and to embrace a new religion which is opposed to the natural dispositions of men. In the words they uttered there must have been an amazing and a divine power controlling the minds of men. To which may be added, miracles, prophecies, the detection of men's secret designs, magnanimity in the midst of perils, contempt for all

little can be said, except that he accompanied Paul, and wrote his history, viz., the book of Acts, and a Gospel. Of *Barnabas*, nothing can be said worth relating, except what is learned from the N. Testament. See *J. A. Fabricius*, *Lux Evangelii*, &c., ch. v., p. 95-115. From this account, imperfect as it is, we may conclude that the apostles and their companions scarcely extended their labours beyond the boundaries of the present Turkish empire.—*Tr.*]

(10) *Eusebius*, *Historia eccles.*, l. vii., c. 18. *Irenæus*, *Hæres.*, lib. i., c. 25, p. 105, edit. Massuet.

(11) ["Of the favourable disposition of the Roman emperors towards Christianity, there is a noticeable testimony in the apology of *Melito* Sardicensis, addressed to Marcus Antoninus, which is preserved by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv., 26. *Melito* here informs the emperor that his predecessors not only tolerated Christianity among the other religions, but also honoured it: *ἦν καὶ ἐν πρόγονοῖς σου πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις θρησκείαις ἐτίμασαν*, which sect if your progenitors honoured with the other religions. He adds, that *Nero* and *Domitian* were the only emperors who allowed the counsels of certain adversaries, to influence them to make Christianity a criminal thing. If what *Melito* here says of *Nero* be true, namely, that he was influenced by the counsels of malevolent persons to persecute the Christians, then there may be some foundation for what *John* of Antioch says, in *Excerptis Valesianis*, p. 808, &c., that *Nero* was favourable to the Christians and to Christ, in the beginning of his reign.—*Tertullian*, *Apologet.*, cap. v., p. 57, ed.

Havercamp, speaks of *Tiberius*' desire to have Christ enrolled among the gods as of a thing universally known. *Eusebius* (*Hist. Eccles.*, ii., 2), *Orosius* (*Chron. Pascal.*, vii., 4), and others afterwards, repeat the story, relying chiefly on the authority of *Tertullian*. See *Fr. Baldwin*, *Comment. ad. edicta Veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis*, p. 22, 23, and *J. A. Fabricius*, *Lux Evangelii*, &c., p. 221. But very learned men in this age have deemed this wholly incredible, and not at all compatible with the character of *Tiberius* and with the state of the empire at that time. In what manner men equally learned and ingenuous have repelled their arguments, may be seen in the *Essay of Theod. Haseus*, de decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum deorum, Erfurt, 1715, 4to, and in the French letter of *J. C. Iselius* on this subject, in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, tom. xxxii., p. 147, and tom. xxxiii., p. 12." *Moshem*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 91, &c.—See also *Altmann*, *Disquisitio historico-critica, de Epistola Pilati ad Tiberium*, &c., Bern, 1755, 8vo. In this essay Professor *Altmann* maintains, (1) That *Pilate* was actually informed of the resurrection of Christ by the guard. (2) That he did really send to *Tiberius* an account of the death and resurrection of Jesus, though not such an account as the one now extant. (3) That *Tiberius* actually proposed in the senate that Jesus should be honoured as a god. This subject is also examined by *Dr. Lardner*, *Collection of Jewish and Heathen testimonies*, vol. iii., p. 599, &c., ed. Lond., 1815, 4to.—*Tr.*]

the objects of ordinary ambition, a patient and cheerful endurance of sufferings worse than death, as well as of death itself, and, finally, lives of the purest and most unblemished character. That the ambassadors of Jesus Christ *were* in fact thus furnished for their work, is a truth perfectly clear and obvious. And if we suppose them not to have been so furnished, no probable reason can be assigned for so rapid a propagation of Christianity by this small and feeble band.

§ 9. To these their personal endowments, must be added the ability possessed by these divine ambassadors of transferring the power of working miracles to their disciples. Many persons, as soon as they were baptized according to Christ's directions, and consecrated to God by prayer and the imposition of hands, were able forthwith to express their thoughts in foreign languages which they had never learned, to foretell future events, to heal the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, to call the dead to life, and to perform other deeds above the power of man. (12) What must have been thought of the men who had ability to confer such wonderful powers on others !

§ 10. Those who fabricate other causes for this surprising revolution in the religious state of the world, offer to us mere dreams, which can never satisfy an attentive observer of human affairs. Some tell us that the kindness of Christians towards the poor, induced a multitude of idle and vicious persons to embrace Christianity. They do not consider that those who embraced Christianity put their lives in jeopardy ; nor do they recollect that idle, profligate, lazy persons were not tolerated among the early Christians [2 Thess. iii., 6-12]. Equally groundless is the representation of others, that the flagitious and profligate lives of the pagan priests caused many to turn Christians. But the vile character of these priests, though it might bring the ancient systems of religion into contempt, could not produce attachment to Christianity, which exposed its votaries to the loss of character, property, and life. The man must be beside himself who could reason thus : " The priests of the religion in which I was educated lead profligate lives ; I will therefore connect myself with persons contemptible and condemned by the public laws, and will thus put my life and fortune to the most imminent hazard." (13)

(12) See, among others, *Tob. Pfanner*, de Charismatis sive donis miraculosis antiquæ ecclesiæ, Francf., 1683, 12mo.

(13) [" Others have supposed that the virtues of the apostles and their early followers, their sobriety, their contempt of wealth, their fortitude, their patience, &c., induced multitudes to put themselves under their religious guidance. Integrity and virtue certainly have influence on the mind of the beholder ; nor would I deny that the holy lives of the apostles produced some effect. But we know, if we are acquainted with ourselves and with human nature, that purity of morals and integrity of life, though they create respect and reverence, rarely produce imitation, and never do, if manifest disgrace and danger will follow that imitation. We know that virtue, and even the most perfect virtue, awakens entire disgust, when it re-

quires men to forsake the institutions and sentiments of their ancestors, and to abandon their chosen enjoyments. This is confirmed by the example of those very apostles who are said to have converted the world by the purity of their characters ; nay, by the example of the *Lord* of those apostles, who was the most perfect pattern of virtue. I can believe, that the blameless lives of the apostles induced individuals among all nations not to lay violent hands on them, nor to show them any abuse ; but to believe, that merely by their strict morals and their disregard for the common objects of human attachment, they induced many thousands to recognise as the Saviour of the world, a person whom the Jews had caused to be crucified, and persuaded them to follow their example, and to suffer death rather than renounce these principles ; this, I say, no one can persuade

CHAPTER V.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of Christians by the Jews in Palestine.—§ 2. By Jews out of Palestine.—§ 3. Divine Judgments on the Jews.—§ 4. Ten Persecutions by the Pagans.—§ 5. Laws against the Christians.—§ 6. Causes of Hostility to them. Charged with Hatred to Mankind.—§ 7. Other Causes of Persecution.—§ 8. Slanders against Christians.—§ 9. Modes of Trial and Punishment.—§ 10. The Martyrs and Confessors.—§ 11. Number of them.—§ 12. Acts of the Martyrs.—§ 13. Persecution by Nero.—§ 14. Its Extent.—§ 15. Persecution under Domitian.

§ 1. **THOUGH** the disciples of *Christ* were distinguished for the excellence of their doctrines and the purity of their lives, yet the Jewish priests and rulers not only treated them with extreme contumely and abuse, but put to death as many of them as they could. This appears from the martyrdom of *Stephen*, Acts vii., 55, of *James* the son of *Zebedee*, Acts xii., 1, 2, and of *James* the *Just*, who presided over the church at Jerusalem. *Josephus*, Antiq. Jud., l. xx., c. 8, and *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 23. The true cause of this hostility of the Jewish priests and doctors, undoubtedly, was their envy, and their fear of losing their personal advantages and their consequence, if Christianity prevailed.

me to believe. And, not to protract these remarks, whence, and by what means, did the apostles themselves acquire that admirable virtue and sanctity, which alone was able to produce in others an invincible determination to fly to Christ, and to cleave to him as the only anchor of their salvation?"—"Others, following the example of *Celsus*, *Julian*, *Porphyry*, and other ancient enemies of Christianity, bid us consider, that the churches gathered by the apostles were composed of plebeian characters, servants, labourers in the fields and workshops, and women; that is, of persons deficient in intelligence, rank, and wealth, who might easily be persuaded to believe almost any thing by persons of but moderate talents. But this, which is here so confidently asserted, was, in the first place, not altogether true. For the Scriptures inform us, that among those converted to Christianity by the apostles, many were affluent, well-informed, and of respectable rank. That there were persons of wealth, see 1 Tim. ii., 9, and 1 Peter iii., 3. That there were men of learning and knowledge of philosophy, see 1 Tim. vi., 20; Col. ii., 8. And that there were some, though not many, noble, see 1 Cor. i., 26. The names of illustrious persons who embraced Christ in the earliest ages of the church, are collected by *D. Blondell*, de

Episcopis et presbyteris, p. 235, and by *J. R. Wetstein*, Prefatio ad Originis Dial. contra Marcion., p. 13. Secondly, those who are not ignorant of the world, know that persons in the lower walks of life not only value themselves, their lives, and their enjoyments, as much as others do, but they much more ardently embrace and cling to the customs, opinions, and religion of their ancestors, than men of genius and influence, the opulent, and persons of rank. Ignorance and timidity produce and nourish superstition. Hence the more ignorant and timid a person is, a stronger hold has superstition of his mind. So that it is an easier thing to eradicate superstition from the minds of ten men, than of one woman, from a hundred well-informed and ingenuous minds, than from ten ignorant, stupid ones. Villany nowhere reigns more than in servants and persons of abject condition. It would be easier, therefore, to purge from iniquity a multitude of the ingenuous and well-born, than even a small number of slaves. Hence, those who make the churches gathered by the apostles of Christ to have been composed of persons of no respectability or rank, of slaves, women, and the illiterate, in my judgment, increase, rather than diminish, the glory achieved by those inspired men."—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., p. 90–92.]

§ 2. No less cruelty was shown to the innocent disciples of *Christ*, by those Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces. It appears from the Acts of the Apostles and from other credible records, that they spared no pains to instigate the magistrates and the populace to destroy the Christians. To this madness they were excited by the high priest and the elders of the Jews living in Palestine; who, as we are informed, sent messengers to the foreign Jews, exhorting them to avoid all connexion with the Christians, and to persecute them as far as was in their power. (1) To give their base designs a specious exterior, they gave out that the Christians had treasonable designs against the Roman government; as appeared by their acknowledging as their king one *Jesus*, a malefactor, whom *Pilate* had most justly punished with death. This rage against the Christians was propagated from father to son, through successive generations; so that the church in after ages had no more bitter enemies than the Jews. (2)

§ 3. But God himself visited this perfidious nation with the sorest judgments, on account of their cruelties to the Saviour and his friends. For he suffered Jerusalem, the capital of Palestine, together with the temple, to be razed to their foundations by the Roman emperor *Vespasian* and his son *Titus*, about forty years after *Christ's* ascension, and an innumerable multitude of the people to perish by the sword, and most of the survivors to be sold into slavery. A more distressing scene than this—which is described at large by *Josephus*, (3) himself a Jew—is perhaps nowhere to be found in the records of history. And from this time onward, the Jews have been everywhere, even more than before, objects of hatred and abhorrence to all nations.

§ 4. The gentiles, who were polytheists, brought upon the Christian church far greater calamities than the Jews, whose power was not equal to their malice. The persecutions of the Christians by the Romans, have for many ages been accounted *ten* in number. (4) But the ancient history of the church does not support precisely this number: for if we reckon only the general and more severe persecutions, they were fewer than ten; but if we include the provincial and more limited persecutions, the number will be much greater than ten. Some Christians of the fifth century were led by certain passages of the Scripture, especially by one in the Apocalypse, ch. xvii., 12–14, to believe that it was decreed, the Christian church must pass through *ten* grievous persecutions; and to this opinion, they afterward endeavoured to accommodate in different ways the dissenting language of history. (5)

(1) See *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 51–53, 109, 138, 318, ed. Jebbs.

(2) [Passages from early Christian writers, who complain of the *Jewish* persecutions, are collected by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. toti orbi exoriens, ch. vi., § 1, p. 121. See also the Epist. of the church of Smyrna, de Martyrio Polycarpi, § xii., xiii.—*Schl.*]

(3) [In his history of the Jewish War. See also *Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, tom. i., cap. 17.—*Schl.*]

(4) The writers on these persecutions are enumerated by *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. toti orbi exoriens, cap. vii., p. 133, &c.

(5) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Historia sacra, lib. ii., c. 33, p. 387, ed. Horn. *Augustinus*, de Civit. Dei, l. xviii., c. 52. [In the fourth century the number of the persecutions had not been defined. *Lactantius*, de Mortibus persecutorum, reckons up only six. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., does not state their number; yet we might make out nine from this writer. This is the number given by *Sulpitius Severus*, in the fifth century. But in his times originated the opinion of just ten persecutions; and *Sulpitius*, to make out that number, includes the persecution of *Antichrist* in the end of the world. See *Mo-*

§ 5. *Nero* first enacted laws for the extermination of Christians. *Domitian* next did the same; and afterward *Marcus Antoninus*, the philosopher, then *Severus*, and the other emperors who were hostile to the Christians. Yet these decrees were not all equally severe, nor all founded on the same causes. A celebrated lawyer of the name of *Domitius*, anciently collected all the imperial laws against the Christians, in his treatise *de Officio Proconsulis*; (6) which, if it were now extant, would doubtless throw much light on the history of the church under the pagan emperors. Now very much is left wholly to conjecture.

§ 6. As the Romans were not accustomed to trouble any people on account of their religion, and as they suffered the Jews in particular to live according to their own laws, it is not improperly asked, what could have induced them to heap so many evils on the heads of Christians, whose religion was so holy and so friendly both to public and private happiness? The first cause of this cruelty I conceive to be, that the Christians condemned and abhorred the public religion of the state, which was so closely connected with the form and administration of the government. For the Romans, though they tolerated all the religions from which the commonwealth had nothing to fear, yet would not suffer the ancient religion of their nation, as established by the laws, to be derided, and the people to be withdrawn from it. Yet both these the Christians dared to do. Nor did they assail the Roman religion only, but likewise the religions of all other nations. Hence the Romans concluded, that the Christian sect was not only arrogant beyond all measure, but likewise unfriendly to the public peace and tranquillity, and calculated to excite civil wars. This, if I do not mistake, is that *odium generis humani*, with which *Tacitus* taxes the Christians; and is the true ground of his denominating Christianity a *destructive superstition*, as well as of the epithet *malignant* (*malefica*), applied to it by *Suetonius*. (7)

§ 7. Another cause of the Roman hostility to Christianity, was, that the Christian worship had none of the things that were common to all other religions. For the Christians offered no sacrifices, and had no temples, no statues, no oracles, no order of priesthood; and the inconsiderate multitude deemed those who were without these, to be destitute of all religion, or to be *atheists*: and by the Roman laws, atheists were regarded as the pests of human society. Besides, the worship of so many pagan deities afforded support to a countless throng of priests, augurs, soothsayers, merchants, and artists; all of whom were in danger of coming to want, if Christianity should prevail; and therefore, with united strength, they rose up against it, and wished to exterminate its followers. (8)

sheim, de Rebus Christ. ante Con. Mag., p. 98, &c.—*Schl.*]

(6) See *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar., lib. v., c. 11. What remain of these laws, are illustrated by *Fran. Baldwin*, Comment. ad edicta veter. princip. Romanor. de Christianis; republished by *N. H. Gundling*, with *Baldwin's* Constant. Magnus, Halle, 1727, 8vo.

(7) See *Tacitus*, Annals, lib. xv., c. 34. *Suetonius*, Nero, cap. 16. Because such as could not endure the sacred rites and the re-

ligion of the Romans, nor those of all the world, seemed to be the foes of mankind, and to indulge hatred towards all nations.

(8) See the account of *Demetrius* the silversmith, Acts xix., 24. *Pliny*, Epist., lib. x., ep. 97. "The temples, which were almost deserted, begin to be frequented again; and the sacred rites, which had been long neglected, are again performed.—The victims which hitherto had found almost no purchasers, begin to come again to the market," &c.

§ 8. Those who were interested to arrest the progress of Christianity, in order to effect their object the sooner, disseminated among the vulgar the basest calumnies against the Christians and their religion. These slanderous stories were too easily credited by the people, who were fickle and credulous. What the stories were, may be learned from the writers of apologies for Christianity in the early ages.(9) The same persons cunningly persuaded the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases that afflicted mankind, were sent upon them by the angry gods, because the Christians, who contemned their authority, were everywhere tolerated.(10) Other and less weighty causes are here omitted.

§ 9. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, which were inflicted on those that venerated *Christ*, are described by learned men in works professedly on that subject.(11) The manner of proceeding before the tribunals, may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters which passed between *Pliny* and *Trajan*, and in other ancient documents.(12) But it is clear, that the mode of proceeding in the courts, was not always the same. For the laws and the rescripts of the emperors, by which the magistrates were to be guided, were different at different periods. Thus, at one period, the Christians were carefully sought after; at another, the judges waited till some one came forward to accuse them. Sometimes the confessing or convicted Christian was hurried forthwith to execution, if he did not renounce his religion; at other times the magistrates laboured, by various species of torture and cruelty, to induce them to apostatize.

§ 10. Those who fell in these perilous days of the church, being put to death in different ways, were called *Martyrs*; a term borrowed from the sacred writings, and denoting that they were *witnesses* for Christ. Those who were bold to *profess* Christ before the magistrates, and for his sake incurred the loss of health, or goods, or honours, were denominated *confessors*. Both obtained immense veneration and influence among the Christians; and they enjoyed prerogatives and honours which were altogether peculiar and extraordinary, and such as would furnish matter for a volume that would be useful in various respects. These prerogatives were undoubtedly conferred on the martyrs and confessors, to induce others more readily to encounter all evils for Christ's sake.(13) But as honours and prerogatives among men, from the defects of human nature, often be-

(9) This subject is nearly exhausted by *Chr. Kortholt*, *Paganus Obtrektor*, seu de Calumniis gentilium in Christianos, in three books, Kilon., 1698, 4to. To which add *J. J. Huldreich*, de Calumniis gentilium in Christianos, Tiguri, 1744, 8vo.

(10) See *Arnobius*, adversus Gentes. [and *Tertullian*, Apologet., c. 40.—*Schl.*]

(11) *Anton. Gallonius*, and *Casp. Sagutarius*, de Cruciatibus Martyrum; the latter printed at Jena, 1673, 4to; the best edition of the former is, Antw., 1668, 12mo. [Both contain mixtures of the doubtful with the true: for the *Acta Martyrum*, now extant, cannot be relied on.—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Chr., &c.]

(12) See *J. H. Bahmer*, Jus. Eccles.

Protest., tom. iv., lib. v., Decretal., tit. i., § 32.

(13) [This seems quite too philosophical an account of this matter. The early Christians did not thus coldly calculate distant consequences and effects, in order to determine what place in their affections, and what rank in the church, they should give to their brethren and pastors who suffered death for their religion. Nature, religion, and all the ties which united them to *Christ*, to the church, and to one another, combined to render these holy men and consistent Christians venerable and lovely in their eyes; and of course to procure them a rank and privileges in the church altogether peculiar. Whoever reads the most authentic accounts of

come sources of evil, so also these were frequently misapplied, and afforded encouragement to superstition and to other evils.

§ 11. That a great number of persons, of both sexes and of every class and rank, suffered death for the cause of *Christ* during the first three or four centuries, no impartial person who is acquainted with the history of those times can hesitate to believe. But since *H. Dodwell's* attempt to invalidate this ancient opinion,(14) many have agreed with him; and have maintained that only a *few* actually suffered death on account of the Christian religion. They have, however, met with strenuous opposers, who regard this opinion as derogatory to the divine power which sustained the martyrs in their conflicts. Those who take the middle path between the two extremes, will probably come nearest to the truth. The *martyrs* were not so numerous as they were anciently supposed to be, and as some still account them; but they were more numerous than *Dodwell* and his friends suppose them. And I apprehend, those persons will readily come into this opinion, who shall learn from the ancient writers that even in the most calamitous times of the church, not *all* Christians everywhere were persecuted and arraigned for trial. Persons in the humbler conditions of life were generally more safe; while greater danger impended over the rich (whose wealth had charms for the judges), and over the learned, the doctors and heads of churches, and over the eloquent and influential.(15)

§ 12. The words and actions of the martyrs, from the time of their arrest till their last moments, were carefully committed to writing, in order to be read over on certain days for the edification of their successors in the church. But a few only of these *Acta Martyrum* have reached us;(16) much the greater part of them having been committed to the flames, during the ten years' war of *Diocletian* against the Christians; for, at that time, the emperor required all the books and papers of Christians to be collected and burned. From the eighth century onward, both the Greeks and the Latins took great pains to compile lives of the ancient martyrs; but the more discerning, even in the Romish church, now admit, that the greater part of these accounts are mere fables dressed up in a style of affected oratory. Nor is more credit due to those catalogues of saints, called *Martyrologies*, which were either compiled by ignorant and incompetent men, or have since been much falsified. Hence, this part of ecclesiastical history enjoys very little light.*

§ 13. *Nero* was the first emperor that persecuted the Christians; and his cruelty was extreme. He accused those innocent people of a crime which he himself had committed, namely, that of setting fire to the city of Rome. And to make the punishment correspond with the crime, he caused the streets of the city to be illuminated, through the night, by the

the ancient martyrs, of Polycarp for instance, will see abundant evidence of the operation of these causes; but nothing of that calculating policy, of which Dr. *Mosheim* speaks.—*Tr.*]

(14) In his noted Dissertation, de Paucitate martyrum, which is the eleventh among his Dissert. Cyprianicæ.

(15) [See *Martyrium Polycarpi*, § 12. *Acta Fructuosi*, in *Ruinart's Acta Martyr. sincera*, p. 219. *Cyprian*, Epist. v. and

xiv., p. 10 and 23, ed. Benedict., and many others.—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M., p. 106.]

(16) Such of them as were not wholly unworthy of credit, were collected in a moderate sized folio, by *Theod. Ruinart*, *Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta*, Amstelod., 1713.

* [See *Adrian Baillet*, *Discours sur l'histoire de la vie des saints*; prefixed to his *Vies des Saints*, Paris, 1704, 4 tomes, fol.—*Tr.*]

burning bodies of many of them, [whom he had sewed up alive in garments covered with pitch.] Others were put to death in a different manner. This persecution began in the middle of November, A.D. 64.(17) In the course of it, the ancients tell us, *Paul* and *Peter* suffered death at Rome: but many cannot believe the fact, because of its repugnance to chronology.(18) This persecution terminated at the death of Nero; who is well known to have been his own executioner, A.D. 68. During about *four years*, therefore, the Christians suffered every species of cruelty at his hands.

§ 14. How far the persecution under *Nero* extended, is not agreed among the learned. For while the greater number suppose it spread over the whole Roman empire, there are those who think it was confined to the city of Rome. The former opinion, which is the more ancient,(19) appears to us the best

(17) See the two French dissertations of *Alph. de Vignoles*, on the Cause and the Commencement of Nero's persecution; in *Phil. Masson's Histoire critique de la Republique des Lettres*, tom. viii., p. 74–117, and tom. ix., p. 172–186. See also *Toinard* on *Lactantius de mortibus persecutorum*, p. 398.

(18) *Sebast. Tillemont*, *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. i., p. 564, &c., and *Baratier*, de Successione Romanor. Pontiff, cap. v., p. 60. —[All agree that both these apostles, *Paul* and *Peter*, were put to death in the reign of *Nero*: but in respect to the year and the place, there is controversy. Many question whether both suffered at the same time. They believe, according to the testimony of *Prudentius*, (Peristephan. de passionis beator. Apostolor. Petri et Pauli, v. 5, 6) that *Peter* suffered one year earlier than *Paul*; but on the same day. As to the day on which *Paul* suffered, some make it the 29th of June; and others, the 23d of February. The year is, by some, determined to A.D. 64; so *von Henschen*, *Acta Sanctor.* April, tom. i. *D. Papebroch*, *Propylaeum ad Acta S.* May; by others, A.D. 65; so *Anton. Pagi*, *Critica*, in *Annal. Baron.*, tom. i., p. 51, 52; and again by others A.D. 67; so *Baumgarten*; and lastly by others A.D. 68; so *John Pearson*, *Annales Paulini*, p. 25, which is the most probable opinion. The day, when both apostles suffered, was probably the 22d of February. That *Paul* was beheaded during *Nero's* persecution, is supported by the testimony of *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. ii., c. 25, and of *Lactantius*, *de Morte Persecutorum*, cap. ii., p. 1375, ed. Bünnemann. As to the place, an obscure writer, *Ulr. Velenus*, in a book, *Quo Petrus Romam venisse demonstratur*, 1660, 4to, p. 40, denies that either apostle suffered at Rome; and endeavours to prove that their martyrdom was at Jerusalem: which also *Bale* maintains in regard to *Peter*, *Centur. Scriptor. Britan.*, p.

16. This opinion is confuted by various writers, who are mentioned in *Walch's Biblioth. theol. Selecta*, tom. iii., p. 458. On this whole subject, consult *W. Cave*, *Life of Paul*, c. vii., § 9, p. 424 of his *Antiq. Apostol.* *Tillemont*, *Mem. pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i., pt. ii., note 42, p. 768, and *Fabricius*, *Codex Apocryph. N. T.*, pt. i., p. 450. On the fabulous circumstances related of Paul's martyrdom, see *J. G. Walch's Hist. Eccles. N. T.*, p. 277.—*Schl.* On the chronology of Paul's life and labours, see *Witsii Meletemata Leidsensia*, 1703, 4to. *Pearson*, *Annales Paul.*, the Introductions to the N. T. by *Eichhorn*, *Bertholt*, *Horne*, &c., and other works referred to in *Winer's Biblisches Realw.*, art. Paul.—*Tr.*]

(19) The first who rejected the common opinion, so far as I know, was *Fran. Baldwin*, [an eminent civilian of Paris, who died A.D. 1573,] in his Comment. ad edicta Imperator. in Christianos, p. 27, 28. After him, *Jo. Launoï*, in *Diss. qua Sulpitii Severi locus de prima martyrum Gallie epocha vindicatur*, § 1, p. 139, 140, tom. ii., pt. i. of his works. Still more learned, and on the same side, was *Henry Dodwell*, *Diss. xi.*, in his *Dissertt. Cypranicæ*, § xiii., p. 59, whom many others have followed; [among whom are *Jo. le Clerc*, *Hist. Eccles. N. Test.*, century i., p. 428. *Joach. Lange*, *Hist. Eccles.*, p. 360. *Nicol. Gürtler*, *Syst. theol. prophet.*, p. 491. *Baumgarten*, *Auszug der Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., p. 376 (who supposes the persecution extended only so far as the jurisdiction of the prætorian prefect); *D. Semler*, *Sel. Capita. Hist. Eccles.*, tom. i., p. 24. (Also *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Handbuch der christl. Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., p. 120; and *A. Neander*, *Algem. Gesch. d. christl. Kirche*, vol. i., pt. i., p. 137.—*Tr.*) The arguments for both opinions are stated in *J. G. Walch*, *Hist. Eccles.*, p. 548, who thinks the question to be altogether doubtful. *Jablonsky* was of the same sentiment, *Insti-*

supported. We do not hesitate to join with those who think, that public laws were then enacted against the whole body of Christians, and were sent abroad into the provinces. To this opinion we are led, among other reasons, by the authority of *Tertullian*, who clearly intimates that *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*, enacted laws against the Christians, which laws *Trajan* in part repealed or annulled.(20) The noted Spanish or Portuguese inscription, in which *Nero* is commended for having purged the province of the new superstition, is suspected by the Spaniards themselves; and I place no reliance on it.(21) The Christians moreover were condemned, not so much for their religion, as on the charge of having set fire to Rome.(22) But who can suppose that a religious sect, which the emperor himself charged with so great a crime, would be quietly tolerated by him beyond the limits of Rome?(23)

tutt. *Historiæ Christ. antiq.*, p. 40.—*Schl.* But see note (23) below.—*Tr.*]

(20) *Tertullian*, *Apologet.*, cap. iv., p. 46, edit. Havercamp.

(21) This inscription may be seen in *J. Gruterus*, *Inscriptionum*, tom. i., p. 238, n. 9. [It is this: "Neroni, ob provinciam latronibus et his, qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant, purgatam."—*Tr.*] But the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the authority of this inscription; because it has not been seen by any one; and *Cyriac of Ancona*, who first produced it, is acknowledged by all to be unworthy of credit. I will subjoin the decision of that excellent and judicious historian of Spain, *Jo. de Ferreras*, *Histoire generale d'Espagne*, tom. i., p. 192. "I cannot refrain from remarking that *Cyriac of Ancona* was the first that published this inscription, and that from him all others have derived it. But as the credibility of this writer is suspected, in the judgment of all the learned, and as not a vestige nor any recollection of this inscription remains, in the places where it is said to have been found, and no one knows now where to find it; every one may form such opinion of it as he pleases."

(22) See *Theod. Ruinart*, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*, p. 31, &c.

(23) [Nearly all the facts relating to this persecution, except the martyrdom of *Peter* and *Paul*, we owe to *Tacitus*, the Roman historian. *Annals*, lib. xv., c. 44. After describing the conflagration, which utterly consumed three of the fourteen wards, and spread ruin in seven others; and likewise the efforts of *Nero* to sooth the indignant and miserable citizens; he says, "But no human aid, no munificence of the prince, nor expiations of the gods, removed from him the infamy of having ordered the conflagration. Therefore, to stop the clamour, *Nero* falsely accused and subjected to the most exquisite punishments a people hated for

their crimes, called *Christians*. The founder of the sect, *Christ*, was executed in the reign of *Tiberius*, by the procurator *Pontius Pilate*. The pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, burst forth again; not only through Judea, the birthplace of the evil, but at Rome also, where every thing atrocious and base centres and is in repute. Those first seized, confessed; then a vast multitude, detected by their means, were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning the city, as of hatred to mankind. And insult was added to their torments; for being clad in skins of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs; or affixed to crosses to be burned, were used as lights, to dispel the darkness of night, when the day was gone. *Nero* devoted his gardens to the show, and held Circensian games, mixing with the rabble, or mounting a chariot, clad like a coachman. Hence, though the guilty and those meriting the severest punishment, suffered; yet compassion was excited, because they were destroyed, not for the public good, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual."—It appears from this account, that a vast multitude (*multitudo ingens*) suffered at Rome,—and suffered in a most inhuman manner;—that they were falsely accused, and by *Nero's* instigation; not because he had any thing against them, but because they were a despised people, and he hoped to avert the public odium from himself. But the case was too plain; their innocence was known, and *Nero's* fiendlike merriment only raised compassion towards them, and increased the odium against him. It is clear, from this account, that the Christians, in the opinion of *Tacitus*, deserved to be exterminated for their religion; yet that *Nero* did not proceed on this ground, but on the false charge of their having kindled the fires of Rome. *Lactantius*, then, (*de Morte persecutorum*, cap. ii.) erred in attributing other designs to *Nero*, namely, the extermination of the *Christian*

§ 15. *Nero* being dead, the fury of this first war against the Christians ceased. But in the year 93 or 94, (24) a new assault was made upon them by *Domitian*, an emperor little inferior to *Nero* in baseness of character and conduct. (25) The cause of the persecution, if we give credit to *Hegesippus*, was the fear of losing his empire; for the emperor had learned in some way that a person would arise from among the relatives of *Christ*, who would attempt a revolution, and would produce commotion in the empire. (26) This persecution undoubtedly was severe: but it was of short continuance, as the emperor was soon after murdered. (27) The principal

religion. The commencement of this persecution is determined, by the time of the conflagration, which *Tacitus* says, (*Annals* xv., 33, 41), began the 18th of July, A.D. 65, (or xiv. Kalend. Sextiles, C. Lecanio, and M. Licinio Coss.), and lasted six days. Some time after, but in the same year, the persecution broke out. But how long it continued is uncertain. If *Paul* and *Peter* suffered in the very last year of *Nero's* reign, as the fathers state, (*Eusebius*, *Chronicon*; and *Jerome*, de *Viris illustr.*, c. i. and v.), the persecution doubtless ceased, only on *Nero's* death. But if they suffered earlier, then we have no proof of the continuance of the persecution so long.—As to the extent of the persecution, it is wholly in the dark. If we consider simply the description of it, or the causes from which it originated, and the feelings of *Nero* towards the Christians, we have no reason to suppose it extended beyond the city of Rome and its neighbourhood. Yet the general impression in former ages, and the belief of many in this age, make the persecution a general one. The only argument of much plausibility for this opinion, is derived from a passage in *Tertullian*, (*Apologet.*, cap. iv., p. 46, ed. Havercamp.) where he speaks of the persecuting laws of the empire, as being enacted by the very vilest and most odious among the emperors, and mentions *Nero* as the first that “drew the sword” against the Christians; and *Domitian* as the second who did so. Whence it is inferred, that *Nero*, as well as *Domitian*, must have enacted public laws against the Christians; and, of course, that the persecution in *Nero's* reign must have been general, or throughout the empire. But considering the fervid, rhetorical style of *Tertullian*, this seems to be a slender foundation, on which to ground a conclusion that has no support from well attested facts.—*Tr.*

(24) [The precise year in which the persecution by *Domitian* began, is not certain. *Toinard* has discussed the point, in his notes on *Lactantius*, de *Morte Persecutorum*, chap. iii. That it raged in the year 95, is stated by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, iii., 18, but how long before this it commenced, is not clear.—*Pagi* (*Crit. annal. Baron.*, tom. i., p. 85, 87),

supposes it began A.D. 93. *Toinard*, (*ubi supra*), A.D. 94; and *Dodwell*, (*Diss. Cyprian.*, xi., p. 71), A.D. 95. *Mosheim*, (*de Reb. Christ. ante C. M.*), says, A.D. 94 or 95.—*Tr.*]

(25) See *Theod. Ruinart*, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum*, p. 32. [*Thom. Ittig*, *Selecta Hist. Eccles. capita*, sæcul. i., cap. 6, § 11, p. 531.—*Schl.*]

(26) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iii., c. 19, 20. [In this simple, unvarnished story, there is nothing difficult to be believed. It is therefore credible, that some enemy of both Jews and Christians, suggested to the emperor that the Jews were expecting a king of David's line, who would give laws to the world; and that the Christians likewise believed that *Christ* would reappear and set up a splendid kingdom; that from both these classes of people, insurrections and trouble were to be feared; and that the tyrant, enraged by the suggestions of the insidious foe, ordered all the posterity of *David* to be sought out and to be put to death; and to prevent the Christians from making disturbance, he commanded them to be put under restraints, or to be punished with severity.—*Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ.*, &c., p. 111.]

(27) [The termination of this persecution is stated differently by the ancients. Some say that *Domitian* himself put an end to it before his death. *Hegesippus*, (in *Eusebius*, *Ecc. Hist.*, l. iii., c. 20), states that *Domitian* having learned that there were Christians of the lineage of *David*, and kinsmen of *Christ*, still living in Palestine, had them brought to Rome, and interrogated them closely respecting their pedigree, their wealth, and the future kingdom of *Christ*. And from their answers and their whole appearance, he concluded he had nothing to fear from them, and dismissed them; and thereupon he published a decree, terminating the persecution. So likewise *Tertullian*, (*Apologet.*, cap. v., p. 60), says of *Domitian*: “He receded from his attempt, and recalled those he had banished.” But *Lactantius*, (*de Morte persecutorum*, cap. 3), represents his acts and edicts as repealed, after his death, and that then it was the church recovered its former state. And *Xiphilin*, on *Nerva*, (*Dion Cas-*

martyrs named, are *Flavius Clemens*, a consul, and his niece or wife, *Flavia Domitilla*.(28) In the midst of this persecution, *John* the apostle, was banished to the isle of Patmos ; but whether he was first cast into a caldron of boiling oil by order of the emperor, and came out alive and unhurt, though asserted by *Tertullian* and others, has appeared to many to be uncertain.(29)

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. The State of Philosophy in the East, little known.—§ 2. Philosophy of the Persians, Chaldeans, and Arabians.—§ 3. Jewish and Egyptian Wisdom.—§ 4. The proper Oriental Philosophy.—§ 5. Its first Principles.—§ 6. Its Patrons not agreed in their Opinions.—§ 7. Its Precepts concerning God.—§ 8. Concerning the Origin of the World.—§ 9. Concerning Human Souls.—§ 10. The Jewish Philosophy.—§ 11. Grecian Learning.—§ 12. Roman Learning and Philosophy.—§ 13. Attention to Science in other Nations.

§ 1. IF it were known what opinions were advanced and maintained by the men of most intelligence among the Oriental nations, at the time when the Christian religion began to enlighten mankind, many things in the early history of the church might be more fully and more accurately explained. But, only a few fragments of Oriental philosophy, as all know, have come down to us ; and those which have reached us, still need the labours of a learned man to collect them all together, to arrange them properly and expound them wisely.(1)

§ 2. The prevailing system in Persia, as is well known, was that of the Magi, who held to two principles or deities, governing the universe, the

sus, l. lxviii., c. 1, abridged by Xiphilin), says, that "Nerva recalled those banished for impiety," i. e., the Christians. Perhaps *Domitian* published an edict favourable to the Christians a little before his death, the benefits of which they began to enjoy, first, after his decease.—*Schl.*]

(28) [See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iii., c. 18, and *Chronicon*, ann. 95. Some have supposed, that the wife and the niece of *Clemens* both had the same name ; and that the first was banished to the island *Pandataria*, near Italy ; and the second, to another island called *Pontia*. See *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'église, tom. ii., p. 124, &c., and *Fleury*, History of the church, lib. ii., § 52.—*Schl.*]

(29) See the amicable discussion between

the Rev. Mr. *Heumann* and myself, in my *Syntagma Diss. ad Historiam eccles. pertinentium*, tom. i., p. 497–546. [The whole controversy seems to rest on a passage in *Tertullian*, de Præscript. adv. hæret., c. 36, as the only original authority for the story, which is in itself improbable. All the more discerning, of late, either doubt or deny the truth of the story.—*Tr.*]

(1) There is extant an English work of *Thomas Stanley*, on the history of Oriental philosophy, which *J. le Clerc* translated into Latin. But that learned man has left the field of Oriental philosophy not to be gleaned only, but to be reaped by others. He is much inferior both in genius and erudition to *Ja. Brucker* ; whose history of philosophy should by all means be consulted.

one good, the other evil. The followers of this system however were not agreed, in respect to the precise nature of these first principles.(2) Nevertheless this doctrine spread over no small portion of Asia and Africa, and particularly over Chaldea, Assyria, Syria, and Egypt, though under different modifications; nor did it leave the Jews untaught with its principles.(3) The Arabians of that and the subsequent ages, were more remarkable for strength and courage than for intellectual culture; for they attained to no celebrity for learning, before the times of *Mohammed*. This their own writers do not deny.(4)

§ 3. The Indians, from the earliest times, were much famed for their love of profound knowledge. Of their philosophical tenets, we could perhaps form an opinion at the present day, if their very ancient sacred book which they denominate *Veda* or *the law*, were brought to light, and translated into some language better known. The accounts given by travellers among the Indians concerning this book, are so contradictory and fluctuating, that we must wait for further information.(5) The Egyptians were

(2) See *Tho. Hyde*, *Historia religionis veterum Persarum*, Oxon., 1700, 4to,—a very learned work, but ill digested, and full of improbable conjectures.

(3) See *Jo. Christoph. Wolf*, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, Hamb., 1707, 8vo,—also *Mosheim*, *Notes on Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 323, 423, &c.

(4) See *Abulpharajus*, de *Moribus Arabum*, p. 6, published by *Pocock*.

(5) I have recently learned, that this most desirable book has been obtained by some French Jesuits residing in India; and that it has been, or will be, deposited in the king of France's library. See *Lettre du P. Calmette à M. de Cartigny*, dans les *Lettres édifiantes et Curieuses des Miss. Etrangères*, xxi., Recueil, p. 455, &c., and xxiii., Rec., p. 161.—[The Hindoo literature and theology were little known, when Dr. Mosheim wrote. Since that time, and especially since the establishment of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, by Sir Wm. Jones, in 1793, this field of knowledge has been explored with equal industry and success. See the *Asiatic Researches*, 13 vols. 4to; Sir Wm. Jones's *Works*, 6 vols. 4to; Rev. Wm. Ward's *View of the Hist.*, &c., of the Hindoos, 3 vols. 8vo, and numerous other works.—But it is not true, that the *Vedas* have been brought to Europe, as Dr. Mosheim had been informed. On the contrary, Mr. Holbrooke, in the 8th vol. of the *Asiatic Res.*, describes them as not worth translating. He says: "They are too voluminous for a complete translation of the whole; and what they contain would hardly reward the labour of the reader, much less that of the translator." The *Vedas* are four in number, called Rig Veda, Yajush Veda, Saman Veda, and Atharvan Veda. The first consists of 5 sections, in 10,000 verses; the second is di-

vided into 80 sections, in 9000 verses; the third consists of 1000 sections, and 3000 verses; the fourth, of nine sections, with subdivisions, and 6000 verses. Besides the four Vedas, the Hindoos have 14 other sacred books of later date and inferior authority; viz., four Upavedas, six Angas, and four Upangas. All these were supposed to be the productions of divine persons, and to contain all true knowledge, secular as well as sacred. The commentaries on these books, the compilations from them, and digests of their principles, are almost innumerable, and constitute the whole encyclopædia of the Hindoos. Several of these have been translated into European languages; namely, *L'Ezour-Vedam*, or ancien commentaire du Vedam, &c., à Yverdon, 1778, 2 vols. 12mo.—The *Bhagavat-Geeta*, or Dialogues of Kreesna and Arjoon, in eighteen lectures, with notes by Cha. Wilkins, Lond., 1785, 4to.—*Bagavadam*, ou doctrine divine, ouvrage Indien canonique sur l'Etre supreme, les dieux, les géans, les hommes, les diverses parties de l'univers, (by Foucher d'Obsonville), à Paris, 1788, 8vo.—*Oupnekhat*, h. e. Decretum legendum, opus ipsa in India rarissimum, continens antiquam et arcanam, seu theolog. et philosoph. doctrinam, e quatuor sacris Indorum libris—excerptam—e Persico idiomate—in Latinum versum—studio et opera, Anquetil du Perron, 1801–2, 2 vols. 4to.—*Institutes of Hindoo Law*, or the ordinances of Menu, translated by Sir Wm. Jones, Lond., 1796, 8vo. The last is supposed to follow next after the Vedas in age. Sir Wm. Jones thinks it was, most probably, compiled about 880 years before Christ, and the Vedas about 300 years earlier. The other sacred books of the Hindoos are much later; yet all are now ancient. From the

unquestionably divided into various sects, disagreeing in opinion ;(6) so that it is a vain attempt which some have made, to reduce the philosophy of this people to one system.

§ 4. But of all the different systems of philosophy that were received in Asia and in a part of Africa in the age of our Saviour, none was so detrimental to the Christian church, as that which was styled *γνῶσις* or *science* ; i. e., the *way to the knowledge of the true God* ; and which we have above called the *Oriental philosophy*, in order to distinguish it from the Grecian. For from this school issued the leaders and founders of those sects, which during the three first centuries disturbed and troubled the Christian church. They endeavoured to accommodate the simple and pure doctrines of Christianity to the tenets of their philosophy ; and in doing so, they produced various fantastic and strange notions, and obtruded upon their followers systems of doctrine which were in part ludicrous, and in part marvellously obscure and intricate. The ancient Greek and Latin fathers, who contended against these sects, supposed indeed that their sentiments were derived from *Plato* ; but those good men, being acquainted with no philosophy but the Grecian, and ignorant of everything oriental, were deceived by the resemblance between some of the doctrines of *Plato* and those embraced by these sects. Whoever compares the Platonic philosophy carefully with the Gnostic, will readily see that they are widely different.(7)

similarity of views between the Hindoo philosophers and those of Greece, it has been thought, that they must have had some intercourse, or that one borrowed from the other. The ideas of the fathers in the Christian church, and of some moderns, would make the Greeks indebted to the Orientals—but *Christoph. Meiners*, (*Historia doctrinæ de uno Deo*), and others, would reverse the stream of philosophic knowledge, by supposing it followed the march of *Alexander's* army from Greece to India. This intercourse between the Indians and the Greeks seems not to have been of long continuance. If it commenced with *Alexander's* Indian expedition, it can scarcely have lasted 80 years ; for the conquest of Media, Persia, and Babylonia, by the Parthians about 250 years before Christ, and the establishment of their empire in those countries, formed a strong barrier to all further intercourse ; and the subversion of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ by the Romans, B.C. 65, must be supposed to be the utmost limits to which it *could* extend. If we consider the flourishing state of the Grecian philosophy before the Asiatic conquests of *Alexander*, and the silence of the western philosophers respecting their intercourse with India during the period supposed, it would seem more probable, that the Indian philosophy was derived from the Grecian, than the latter from the former. It is to be hoped, this subject will receive more light from the investigations which are going forward with such success in the present age.—*Tr.*]

(6) [See Dr. *Mosheim's* notes on *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, tom. i., p. 415.]

(7) [Dr. *Mosheim* in this and the four following sections describes an *Oriental philosophy*, the supposed parent of the Gnostic systems, as if its existence was universally admitted, and its character well understood. Yet the system here described is of his own formation ; being such a system as must have existed, according to his judgment, in order to account for the Gnosticism of the early ages. In his *Comment. de Rebus Christ.*, &c., p. 19–21, and in his *Diss. de Causis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos Sæculi primi et secundi*, § 3–6, (inter *Dissertt. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, vol. i., p. 223–232), he confesses, that he has little evidence, except the *necessity* of the supposition, for the existence of this philosophy. He also admits, that the fathers knew nothing of it ; and he might have added, that they testify that *Gnosticism* had no existence till the days of *Adrian*, in the *second* century. Since Dr. *Mosheim* wrote, some have believed with him ; others have rejected his hypothesis altogether ; and others again have taken a middle course, which is probably the nearest to the truth. These last suppose, that the Jews and the Greeks of Asia and Egypt, imbibed something of the *spirit common to most of the Asiatic wise men*, and which shows itself in the Braminic, the Zoroastrian, and the Sufi or Persian speculations ; namely, a disposition to indulge the *imagination*, and to depend on *contemplation* rather than *ratiocina-*

§ 5. The first principles of this philosophy seem to have been dictated by reason itself. For its author undoubtedly thus reasoned: There is much evil in the world; and men are hurried on as by the instinct of nature, to what reason condemns. Yet that eternal *Mind*, from whom all other spirits emanated, is doubtless perfectly free from evil, or is infinitely good and beneficent. Hence the source of the evils with which the world abounds, must be something *external* to the Deity. But there is nothing external to him, except what is material: and therefore *matter* is to be regarded as the source and origin of all evil and all vice. From these principles the conclusion was, that matter existed eternally, and independently of God; and that it received its present form and organization, not from the will or fiat of God, but from the operations of some being of a nature inferior to God; in other words, that the world and the human race came from the forming hand, not of the Supreme Deity, but of one of inferior capacity and perfections. For who can believe that the supreme God, who is infinitely removed from all evil, would mould and fashion *matter* which is in its nature evil and corrupt, and would impart to it any portion of his rich gifts? But attempting to go farther, and to explain *how*, or by what accident or operator, that rude and malignant substance, called matter, became so skilfully arranged and organized; and especially, how souls of celestial origin became joined with bodies composed of it, both reason and common sense forsook them. They therefore resorted to their imaginative faculty, or to mere fables, in order to explain the origin of the world and of mankind.

§ 6. But as those, who undertake to explain what is obscure and difficult of solution by means of mere conjecture, can very seldom agree; so those who attempted to solve this difficulty, split into various sects. Some conceived there must be *two eternal first principles*, the one presiding over

tion, as the means of arriving at truth. Something of *this spirit* appears also in the Platonic philosophy, especially in the later or Eclectic Platonism. Besides, the Asiatics in all ages, like the early Grecian philosophers, were much inclined to limit their philosophical speculations to *cosmogony*; and likewise to adopt, as the supposed first or grand operative cause, a *physical* rather than an intelligent principle; or, in other words, to attribute the origin of all things to *generation, vegetation, emanation, attraction*, or some such *natural* operation, rather than to the contrivance and the fiat of an almighty and intelligent Spirit. Hence the Jews and some early Christian sects, without embracing the peculiar tenets of the Magi or of any other philosophers, oriental or occidental, yet imbibing the Asiatic *spirit* of searching after wisdom by means of *contemplation* rather than ratiocination, and at the same time leaning towards the supremacy of *physical* causes, were led to frame systems of philosophical divinity altogether peculiar. Such was, probably, the origin of the Jewish Kabbalistic system; and also of those multifarious systems which

bore the common name of Gnosticism. Elaborate attempts have been made to trace these systems back to some species of pagan philosophy as their legitimate source; but with very little success. They seem to have originated in the speculations of Jews and Christians, who indulged their own fancies, and explained the principles of revealed religion in a manner peculiar to themselves. That Gnosticism, as such, had no existence in the *first* century, and that it is in vain sought for in the N. Testament, appears to be satisfactorily proved by C. C. Tittmann, *Tractatus de vestigiis Gnosticorum* in N. T. frustra quæsitis, Lips., 1773, p. 253, 12mo. That, notwithstanding many points of resemblance can be traced, it is materially different from any system of either Grecian or Oriental philosophy, it is the object of F. Ant. Levald to show, *Comment. ad historiam, &c., de doctrina Gnostica*, Heidelb., 1818, p. 157, 12mo. For very ingenious and profound speculations on the subject generally, see Aug. Neander, *Allgem. Gesch. der christl. Religion und Kirche*, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 627-670.—*Tr.*]

light, the other over matter ; and by the contests between these principles, they accounted for the mixture of good and evil in our world. Others assigned to matter, not an *eternal lord*, but an *architect* merely ; and they supposed, that some one of those immortal beings whom God produced from himself, was induced by some casual event to attempt the reduction of matter, which lay remote from the residence of God, into some kind of order, and moreover to fabricate men. Others again, imagined a sort of *Triumvirate* ; for they distinguished the Supreme Deity from the prince of matter and the author of all evil on the one hand, and from the architect and builder of the world on the other. When these three systems came to be dilated and explained, new controversies unavoidably arose, and numerous divisions followed ; as might be expected from the nature of the case, and as the history of those Christian sects which followed this philosophy, expressly declares.

§ 7. Yet, as all these sects set out upon one and the same first principle, their disagreements did not prevent their holding certain doctrines and opinions in common, respecting God, the world, mankind, and some other points. They all, therefore, maintained the existence from eternity of a Being, full of goodness, wisdom, and the other virtues, of whom no mortal can form a complete idea ; a Being, who is the purest *light*, and is diffused through that boundless *space* to which they gave the Greek appellation of *Plerōma* ; that this eternal and most perfect Being, after existing alone and in absolute repose during an infinite period, produced out of himself two spirits, of different sexes, and both perfect resemblances of their parent ; that from the marriage of these two spirits, others of a similar nature originated ; that successive generations ensued ; and thus, in process of time, a *celestial family* was formed in the *Plerōma*. This divine progeny, being immortal and unchangeable in their nature, these philosophers were disposed to call *Ἀιῶνες*, *Aeons* ; a term which signifies *eternal*, or beyond the influence of time and its vicissitudes. (8) But how numerous these *Aeons* were, was a subject of controversy among them.

§ 8. Beyond the region of light where God and his family dwell, exists a rude and unformed mass of matter, heaving itself continually in wild commotion. This mass, one of the celestial family, either accidentally wandering beyond the *Plerōma* at a certain time, or sent out by the Deity, first reduced to order and beauty, and then peopled it with human beings and with animals of different species, and finally endowed

(8) The word *αἰὼν* properly signifies an *infinite*, or at least indefinite *duration*, and is opposed to a finite or a temporary duration. But by metonymy, it was used to designate immutable *beings* who exist for ever. It was so used, even by the Greek philosophers, about the commencement of the Christian era ; as appears from a passage in *Arrian*, *Diss. Epictet.*, lib. ii., § 5, where *αἰὼν* is opposed to *ἀνθρώπος* or to a frail, changeable being. *Ὁν γὰρ ἐμὶ αἰὼν ἄλλ' ἀνθρώπος, μέρος τῶν πάντων, ὡς ὅρα ἡμέρας, ἐνστήναι με δεῖ ὡς τὴν ὥραν, καὶ παρελθεῖν ὡς ὥραν.* I am not an *Aeon*, (an eternal and unchangeable being), but a *man* ; and a part of the universe, as an hour is a part

of the day ; like an hour I must exist, and then pass away.—It was therefore not a novel application of the term *αἰὼν* by the Gnostics, to use it as the designation of a celestial and immortal *being*. And even the fathers of the ancient church apply the term to *angels*, both good and bad. That *all* who were addicted to the Oriental philosophy, whether Greeks or not, used the term in this sense, appears from a passage in *Manes*, the Persian, who, as *Augustine* testifies, called the celestial beings *αἰῶνες*, or, as *Augustine* translates it, *sæcula*. Some have supposed it so used even in the New Test., e. g., Ephes. ii., 2, and Heb. i., 2.—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M., p. 30.]

and enriched it with some portions of the celestial light or substance. This builder of the world, who was distinct from the supreme God, they called the *Demiurge*. He is a being, who, though possessed of many shining qualities, is arrogant in his nature, and much inclined to domination. He therefore claims absolute authority over the new world he has built, as being properly his right, to the exclusion altogether of the supreme God; and he requires of mankind, to pay divine honours exclusively to him, and to his associates.

§ 9. Man is composed of a terrestrial, and therefore a vicious body; and of a celestial soul, which is in some sense a particle of the Deity himself. The nobler part, the soul, is miserably oppressed by the body, which is the seat of base lusts; for it is not only drawn away by it from the knowledge and worship of the true God, and induced to give homage and reverence to the Demiurge and his associates, but it is likewise filled and polluted with the love of terrestrial objects and of sensual pleasures. From this wretched bondage, God labours to rescue his offspring, in various ways; and especially by the messengers whom he often sends to them. But the Demiurge and his associates, eager to retain their power, resist in all possible ways the divine purpose of recalling souls back to himself, and labour with great pains to obscure and efface all knowledge of the supreme Deity. In this state of conflict, such souls as renounce the framers and rulers of the world, and, aspiring after God their parent, suppress the emotions excited by depraved matter, will when freed from the body ascend immediately to the *Plerōma*: while those which continue in the bondage of superstition and of corrupt matter, must pass into other bodies, till they shall awake from this sinful lethargy. Yet God will ultimately prevail; and having restored to liberty most of the souls now imprisoned in bodies, he will dissolve the fabric of the world; and then the primitive tranquillity will return, and God will reign with the happy spirits in undisturbed felicity to all eternity.

§ 10. The state of learning and especially of philosophy among the Jews, is manifest from what has already been said respecting the condition of that nation. It appears from the books of the New Testament, that the recondite science which they called *Kabbala*, was even then taught and inculcated by not a few among them. This science was in many respects, very similar to that philosophy which we have called *Oriental*; or rather, it is this philosophy itself, accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with some mixture of truth. Nor were the Jews, at that time, wholly ignorant of the doctrines of the Grecian sages; for from the days of *Alexander* the Great, they had incorporated some of them into their religion. Of the opinions which they had adopted from the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and the Syrians, I shall say nothing. (9)

§ 11. The Greeks are regarded by most writers, as continuing to hold the first rank in learning and philosophy. There were among them at that time, and especially at Athens, acute and eloquent men, who taught the precepts of philosophy, as held by the ancient sects founded by Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus; and who also instructed youth in the prin-

(9) See *J. F. Buddeus*, *Introductio in historiam philos. Hebraeorum*; and the writers named by *Wolffius*, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, tom. iii., [but especially, *Brucker's Hist. crit. philos.*, tom. ii., period ii., pt. i., l. ii., c. i., p. 652.—*Schl.*]

ciples of eloquence, and in the liberal arts. Hence those who were eager for learning, resorted to Greece from all quarters. At Alexandria in Egypt, likewise, Grecian philosophers and rhetoricians were no less numerous; so that thither also, there was a general resort of scholars, as to a literary market.

§ 12. Among the Romans of this age, every branch of learning and science was cultivated. The children of good families were, from their earliest years, instructed carefully in Grecian literature and eloquence; they next applied themselves to philosophy and the civil law; and at last repaired to Greece, to complete their education.(10) Among the sects of philosophers, none were more acceptable to the Romans than the Epicureans and Academics, whom the leading men followed in great numbers, in order to indulge themselves in a life of pleasure without fear or remorse. So long as *Augustus* reigned, the cultivation of the fine arts was held in high honour. But after his death, the succeeding emperors being more intent on the arts of war than those of peace, these studies gradually sunk into neglect.

§ 13. The other nations, as the Germans, Celtes, and Britains, were certainly not destitute of men distinguished for their genius and acumen. In Gaul, the inhabitants of Marseilles had long been much famed for their attention to learning:(11) and they had, doubtless, diffused some knowledge among the neighbouring tribes. Among the Celtes, the *Druids* who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were renowned for their wisdom; but the accounts of them now extant, are not sufficient to acquaint us with the nature of their philosophy.(12) The Romans moreover introduced literature and philosophy into all the countries which they brought under their subjection, for the purpose of softening their savage tempers, and promoting their civilization.(13)

(10) See *Paganini Gaudentii*, liber de Philosophiæ apud Romanos initio et progressu, in the 3d vol. of the *Nova variorum scriptorum collectio*, Halle, 1747, 8vo, 2d edition.

(11) See the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, par des Religieux Benedictins, Diss. prelim., p. 42. &c.

(12) *Ja. Martini*, Religion des Gaulois, liv. i., cap. 21, p. 175, and various others, who have written concerning the Druids. [This work of *Martin* is said to be far inferior to the following; viz., *Histoire des Celtes et particulièrement des Gaulois et des*

Germaines—par *Sim. Pelloutier*, augmenté par *M. de Chiniac*, Paris, 1771, 8 vols. 12mo, and 2 vols. 4to; also *Freret*, *Obss. sur la nature et les dogmes—de la relig. Gauloise*; in the *Histoire de l'Acad. des Inscrip.*, tome xviii.; and his *Obss. sur la relig. des Gaulois*, &c., in the *Memoires de Littérature*, tirés des registres de l'Acad. des Inscrip., tome xxiv., Paris, 1756. Also the Introductory part of *Alsatia illustrata*—auctore *J. Dun. Schoepflino*, tom. i., § 96, Colmar, 1751, fol.—*Tr.*]

(13) *Juvenal*, *Satyræ* xv., 110–113.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Necessity of Teachers in the Church.—§ 2. Extraordinary Teachers.—§ 3. Authority of the Apostles.—§ 4. The seventy Disciples.—§ 5. Christ nowhere determined the Form of his Church. Constitution of the Church of Jerusalem.—§ 6. Rights of the People. Contributions for the Public Expense.—§ 7. Equality of the Members. Rites of Initiation. Catechumens and the Faithful.—§ 8. Order of Rulers. Presbyters.—§ 9. Prophets.—§ 10. Deacons of the Church at Jerusalem. Deaconesses.—§ 11. Bishops.—§ 12. Character of Episcopacy in this Century.—§ 13. Origin of Dioceses, and rural Bishops.—§ 14. Whether there were Councils and Metropolitans in the *first* Century.—§ 15. The principal Writers; the Apostles.—§ 16. Time of Completion of the Canon.—§ 17. Apocryphal Writings and Pseudepigrapha.—§ 18. Clemens Romanus.—§ 19. Writings falsely ascribed to him.—§ 20. Ignatius of Antioch.—§ 21. Polycarp, Barnabas, Hermas.—§ 22. Character of the Apostolic Fathers.

§ 1. As it was the design of our Saviour, to gather a church from among all nations, and one which should continue through all ages, the nature of the case required him first to appoint *extraordinary teachers*, who should be his *ambassadors* to mankind, and everywhere collect societies of Christians; and then, that he should cause to be placed in these societies *ordinary teachers*, and interpreters of his will, who should repeat and enforce the doctrines taught by the extraordinary teachers, and keep the people steadfast in their faith and practice. For any religion will gradually be corrupted, and become extinct, unless there are persons continually at hand, who shall explain and inculcate it.

§ 2. The *extraordinary teachers*, whom *Christ* employed in setting up his kingdom, were those intimate friends of his whom the Scriptures denominate *apostles*; and those *seventy disciples* of whom mention was made above. To these, I apprehend, must be added those who are called *evangelists*; that is, as I suppose, those who were either sent forth to instruct the people by the apostles, or who of their own accord, forsaking other employments, assumed the office of promulgating the truths which *Christ* taught.(1) And to these, we must further add those, to whom in the infancy of the church, God imparted ability to speak in foreign languages which they had never learned. For he on whom the divine goodness conferred the *gift of tongues*, ought in my judgment, to infer from this gift, that God designed to employ *his* ministry in propagating the Christian religion.(2)

§ 3. Many have undertaken to write the history of the *apostles*,—a history full of fables, doubts, and difficulties, if we pursue it farther than the books of the N. Test., and the most ancient ecclesiastical writers are our guide.(3) An apostle was a man who was *divinely instructed*; and who

(1) Ephes. iv., 11. See *Eusebius*, Hist. eccles., lib. iii., c. 37.

(2) 1 Corinth. xiv., 22, &c.

(3) Writers of the lives of the apostles, are enumerated by *Casp. Sagittarius*, In-

troductio ad Historiam eccles., cap. i., p. 2, and by *J. Fr. Buddeus*, de Ecclesia Apostolica, p. 673, &c. [Some notices of their lives are given above, in notes (8) and (9), p. 47.—*Tr.*]

was invested with the power of *making laws*, of *punishing the guilty and wicked* when there was occasion, and of *working miracles* when they were necessary; and who was *sent by Christ himself*, to make known to mankind the divine pleasure and the way of salvation, to separate those who obeyed the divine commands from all others, and to unite them in the bonds of a religious society.(4)

§ 4. Our knowledge of the *seventy disciples* of Christ, is still more imperfect than that of the apostles; for they are but once mentioned in the N. Test., Luke x., 1. Catalogues of them, indeed, are extant; but these being fabricated by the Greeks in the middle ages, have little or no authority or credibility. Their mission was, as appears from the words used by *Luke*, solely to the Jewish nation. Yet it is very probable, that after the Saviour's ascension to heaven, they performed the duties of *evangelists*; and that they taught in various countries, the way of salvation which they had learned from *Christ*.(5)

§ 5. As to the external *form* of the church, and the mode of governing it, neither *Christ* himself nor his apostles gave any express precepts. We are therefore to understand, that this matter is left chiefly to be regulated as circumstances from time to time may require, and as the discretion of civil and ecclesiastical rulers shall judge expedient.(6) If however—what

(4) See *Fred. Spanheim*, de Apostolis et Apostolatu, tom. ii., Opp., p. 289, &c. In ascribing *legislative powers* to the apostles, I have proceeded considerably, and as I think, on good grounds. I am aware that eminent men at this day, deny them this power; but perhaps they differ from me, more in words than in reality. [Dr. *Mosheim* founded his opinion on Matt. x., 20; John xiii., 20; Luke x., 16; 1 Tim. iii., 1; 1 Cor. xi., 34; xiv., 34; and Titus i., 5. See his Instit. hist. Christ. majores, p. 158, &c.—*Schl.*]

(5) Catalogues of the seventy disciples are extant, subjoined to the libri iii. de vita et morte Mosis, elucidated by *Gilbert Gaultmin*; and again published by *J. A. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, p. 474. [See an account of these catalogues in note (5), p. 43, above.—*Tr.*]

(6) ["Those who imagine that *Christ* himself, or the *apostles* by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed *form of church government*, are not agreed what that form was. The *principal opinions* that have been adopted upon this head, may be reduced to the four following. The first is, that of the *Roman Catholics*, who maintain that *Christ's* intention and appointment was, that his followers should be collected into *one sacred empire, subjected to the government of St. Peter and his successors*, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, *Peter* fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at *Rome*, but afterward, to alleviate the burden of his office, divided the church into

three greater provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at *Rome*, the Asiatic at *Antioch*, and the African at *Alexandria*; that the *bishops* of each province, among whom there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the *Roman pontiff*. See *Leo Allatius*, de perpetua consensu Eccles. Orient. et Occidentalis, lib. i., cap. ii., and *Morin*, Exercitat. ecclesiast., lib. i., exerc. i. This romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The *second* opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a *supreme head*, or of *patriarchs* constituted by divine authority; but it supposes that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many *ecclesiastical provinces* as there were secular or civil ones; that the *metropolitan bishop*, i. e., the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province, and that the *other bishops* were subject to *his* authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the Romish church; (*Petrus de Marca*, De concord. sacerdot. et imperii, lib. vi., cap. i. *Morin*, Exerc. Eccles., lib. i., exerc. xviii., and *Pagi*, Critica in Annal Baronii, ad. ann. 37, tom. i., p. 29), and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines; (*Hammond*, Diss. de Episcop. *Beverege*, Cod. Canon. vet. Ec-

no Christian can doubt, the apostles of *Jesus Christ* acted by a divine command and guidance, then that form of the primitive churches which they derived from the church of Jerusalem, erected and organized by the apostles themselves, must be accounted *divine*: but still it will not follow that this form of the church was to be perpetual, and unalterable. In those primitive times, each Christian church was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants or deacons*. (7) These *must* be the component parts of every society. The principal voice was that of the *people*, or of the whole body of Christians; for even the apostles themselves inculcated by their example, that nothing of any moment was to be done or determined on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood, Acts i., 15; vi., 3; xv., 4; xxi., 22. And this mode of proceeding, both prudence and necessity required, in those early times.

§ 6. The assembled people, therefore, elected their own rulers and teachers, or by their free consent received such as were nominated to them. They also by their suffrages rejected or confirmed the laws, that were proposed by their rulers, in their assemblies; they excluded profligate and lapsed brethren, and restored them; they decided the controversies and disputes that arose; they heard and determined the causes of presbyters and deacons; in a word, the people did everything that is proper for those in whom the *supreme power* of the community is vested. In return for all these rights, the people supplied the funds necessary for the support of the teachers, the deacons and the poor, for the public exigencies and for unforeseen emergencies. These funds consisted of voluntary contributions in every species of goods, made by individuals according to their ability, at their public meetings; and hence they were called *oblations*.

§ 7. Among all members of the church of whatever class or condition, there was the most perfect equality; which they manifested by their love-

cles vindic., lib. ii., cap. v., tom. ii. Patr. Apostol., and Usher, de origine Episcop. et Metropol., p. 20). Some Protestant writers of note have endeavoured to prove, that it is not supported by sufficient evidence; (*Basnage*, Hist. de l'Eglise, tom. i., livr. i., cap. 8. *Bochmer*, Annot. ad Petruin de Marca de concordia sacerdot. et imperii, p. 143).—The *third* opinion is that of those who acknowledge, that when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority; though they confess, at the same time, that it is *consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ* and his apostles, that there should be, in every Christian church, one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges, above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world; and also by many in other countries and communions.—The *fourth* and last opinion, is that of the *Presbyterians*, who affirm that *Christ's* intention was, that the Christian doctors and ministers should

all enjoy the same rank and authority, without any sort of pre-eminence or subordination, or distinction of rights and privileges. The reader will find an ample account of these *four* different opinions with respect to church government, in *Dr. Mosheim's* larger history of the first century."

"The truth of the matter is, that *Christ*, by leaving this matter *undetermined*, has, of consequence, left Christian societies a *discretionary power* of modelling the government of the church in such a manner as the circumstantial reasons of times, places, &c. may require; and, therefore, the *wisest* government of the church is the *best* and the *most divine*; and every Christian society has a *right* to make laws for itself; provided that these laws are consistent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity."—*Mael.*]

(7) [*Eusebius*, (Demonstratio Evang., l. vii., c. 2), omits the *deacons*, unless he includes them among the rulers; for he divides a church into *ἡγούμενοι*, *πιστοὺς*, and *κατηχουμένους*, the *rulers*, the *faithful*, and *catechumens*.—*Schl.*]

feasts, by their use of the appellatives *brethren* and *sisters*, and in other ways. Nor in this first age of the church, was there any distinction between the initiated and the candidates for initiation. For whoever professed to regard *Jesus Christ* as the Saviour of the world, and to depend on him alone for salvation, was immediately baptized and admitted into the church. But in process of time, as the churches became enlarged, it was deemed advisable and necessary, to distribute the people into two classes, the *faithful* and the *catechumens*. The former were, such as had been solemnly admitted into the church by baptism; and who might be present at all the parts of religious worship, and enjoy the right of voting in the meetings of the church. The latter, not having yet received baptism, were not admitted to the common prayers, nor to the sacred supper, nor to the meetings of the church.

§ 8. The rulers of the church were denominated, sometimes *presbyters* or *elders*,—a designation borrowed from the Jews, and indicative rather of the wisdom than the age of the persons; and sometimes, also, *bishops*; for it is most manifest, that *both terms* are promiscuously used in the N. Testament of one and the same class of persons, Acts xx., 17, 28; Phil. i., 1; Tit. i., 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii., 1. These were men of gravity, and distinguished for their reputation, influence, and sanctity, 1 Tim. iii., 1, &c.; Tit. i., 5, &c. From the words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. v., 17, it has been inferred, that some elders *instructed* the people, while others served the church in other ways. But this distinction between *teaching* and *ruling elders*, if it ever existed, (which I will neither affirm nor deny), was certainly not of long continuance; for St. Paul makes it a requisite qualification of *all* presbyters or bishops, that they be *able to teach* and instruct others, 1 Tim. iii., 2, &c. (8)

§ 9. As there were but few among the first professors of Christianity, who were learned men and competent to instruct the rude and uninformed in divine things, it became necessary that God should raise up in various churches extraordinary teachers, who could discourse to the people on religious subjects in their public assemblies, and address them in the name of God. Such were the persons, who in the New Testament are called *prophets*, Rom. xii., 6; 1 Cor. xii., 28; xiv., 3, 29; Ephes. iv., 11. The functions of these men are limited too much, by those who make it to have been their sole business to expound the Old Testament scriptures, and especially the prophetic books. (9) Whoever professed to be such a herald of God, was allowed publicly to address the people; but there were present among the hearers divinely constituted judges, who could by infallible criteria, discriminate between true and false prophets. The order of prophets ceased, when the necessity for them was past.

§ 10. That the church had its public servants or *deacons*, from its first foundation, there can be no doubt; since no association can exist without

(8) See concerning the word *presbyter*, *Camp. Vitringa*, de Synagoga vetere, lib. iii., p. i., cap. i., p. 609, and *J. Bened. Carpzov*, Exercit. in epist. ad Hebræos ex Philone, p. 499. On the thing itself, or rather the persons designated by this title, see *J. Fr. Buddeus*, Ecclesia Apostol., cap. vi., p. 719, and *Christoph. Matt. Pfaff*, de Originibus Juris eccles., p. 49.

(9) [See *Mosheim's* Diss. de illis, qui prophetæ vocantur in N. T., in the 2d vol. of his Diss. ad Hist. Eccl. pertinentes, p. 125, &c.; also *Witsius*, Miscell. Sacra, tom. i.; *Koppé*, Excurs. iii. in Epistolam ad Ephes.; *Schleusner*, Lexicon in N. Test., art. προφήτης, no. 10, and *Neander's* Gesch. der Pflanzung, der christl. Kirche durch die Apostol., p. 32, 116.—Tr.]

its servants ; and least of all, can such associations as the first Christian churches, be without them. Those *young men*, who carried out the corpses of *Ananias* and his wife, were undoubtedly the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, who were attending on the apostles and executing their commands, Acts v., 6. 10.(11) These first deacons of that church were chosen from among the Jewish Christians born in Palestine ; and as they appeared to act with partiality in the distribution of alms among the native and foreign Jewish Christians, seven other deacons were chosen by order of the apostles, out of that part of the church at Jerusalem which was composed of strangers, or Jews of foreign birth, Acts vi., 1, &c. Six of these new deacons were foreign Jews, as appears from their names ; the other *one* was from among the *proselytes* ; for there was a number of proselytes among the first Christians of Jerusalem, and it was suitable that *they* should be attended to as well as the foreign Jews. The example of the church of Jerusalem, was followed by all the other churches, in obedience to the injunctions of the apostles ; and of course, *they* likewise appointed *deacons*, 1 Tim. iii., 8, 9. There were also, in many churches, and especially in those of Asia, female public servants, or *deaconesses* ; who were respectable matrons or widows, appointed to take care of the poor, and to perform several other offices.(12)

(11) Those who may be surprised, that I should consider the *young men* who interred the bodies of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to be the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, are desired to consider, that the words *νεώτεροι* and *νεανίσκοι*, *young men*, are not always indicative of age ; but often, both among the Greeks and Latins, indicate a *function* or office. For the same change is made in these words as in the word *presbyter* ; which every one knows is sometimes indicative of age, and sometimes merely of office. As, therefore, the word *presbyter* often denotes the rulers or head men of a society or association, without any regard to their age ; so also the terms *young men* and *the younger*, not unfrequently denote the *servants* or *those that stand in waiting* ; because ordinarily men in the vigour of life perform this office. Nor is this use of the word foreign from the N. Testament. The Saviour himself seems to use the word *νεώτερος* in this sense, Luke xxii., 26, ὁ μεῖζων ἐν ὑμῖν. γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος. The word *μεῖζων*, he himself explains by ἡγούμενος, so that it is equivalent to *ruler* or *presbyter* : and instead of *νεώτερος*, he in the next clause uses ὁ διακωνῶν, which places our interpretation beyond all controversy. So that *μεῖζων* and *νεώτερος* are not, here, indicative of certain ages, but of certain offices ; and the precept of *Christ* amounts to this : “ Let not him that performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the public servants or deacons.” Still more evident is the passage, 1 Peter v., 5, ὡμῶς νεώτεροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέρους. It is manifest from

what goes before, that *presbyter* here is indicative of rank or office, denoting *teacher* or *ruler* in the church ; therefore its counterpart, *νεώτερος*, has the same import ; and does not denote persons young in years, but the servants or *deacons* of the church. *Peter*, after solemnly exhorting the *presbyters* not to abuse the power committed to them, turns to the *deacons*, and says : “ And likewise ye younger, i. e., ye *deacons*, despise not the orders of the presbyters, but perform cheerfully whatever they require of you.” In this same sense the term is used by *Luke*, Acts v., 6, 10, where *νεώτεροι* or *νεανίσκοι* are the *deacons* of the church at Jerusalem, the very persons whom, a little after, the Hellenists accused before the apostles of not distributing properly the contributions for the poor. I might confirm this sense of the term *young men*, by numerous citations from Greek and Latin writers, both sacred and profane ; but this is not the place for such demonstrations.

(12) For an account of the *deacons* and *deaconesses* of the ancient churches, see *Cosp. Ziegler*, de diaconis et diaconissis, Wittenb., 1678, 4to. *Sam. Basnage*, Annales polit. eccles. ad ann. 35, tom. i., p. 450. *Jos. Bingham*, Origines Ecclesiast., book ii., ch. 20, [and *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. ante Constan. M., p. 118, &c., where he defends, at great length, his somewhat peculiar views respecting the *seven deacons* of the church at Jerusalem. See, concerning deacons and deaconesses, *Neander's Gesch. der Pflanzung*, p. 26, 27, 29, &c., 131.—*Tr.*]

§ 11. In this manner, Christians managed ecclesiastical affairs so long as their congregations were small, or not very numerous. Three or four presbyters, men of gravity and holiness, placed over those little societies, could easily proceed with harmony, and needed no head or president. But when the churches became larger, and the number of presbyters and deacons, as well as the amount of duties to be performed, was increased, it became necessary, that the council of presbyters should have a *president*, a man of distinguished gravity and prudence, who should distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and be as it were the central point of the whole society. He was, at first, denominated *the angel*; (Apocal. ii. and iii.) (13) but afterward *the bishop*; a title of Grecian derivation, and indicative of his principal business. It would seem that the church of *Jerusalem*, when grown very numerous, after the dispersion of the apostles among foreign nations, was the *first* to elect such a president; and that other churches, in process of time, followed the example. (14)

§ 12. But whoever supposes that the bishops of this first and golden age of the church, corresponded with the bishops of the following centuries, must blend and confound characters that are very different. For in this century and the next, a bishop had charge of a *single* church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its *lord*, but was in reality its *minister* or servant; he instructed the people, conducted all parts of public worship, and attended on the sick and necessitous, in person; and what he was unable thus to perform, he committed to the care of the presbyters; but without power to ordain or determine any thing, except with the concurrence of the presbyters and the brotherhood. (15) The emoluments of this singularly laborious and perilous office, were very small. For the churches had no revenues, except the voluntary contributions of the people, or the *oblations*; which, moderate as they doubtless were, were divided among the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, and the poor of the church.

§ 13. It was not long, however, before the extent of episcopal jurisdiction and power was enlarged. For the bishops who lived in the cities, either by their own labours or by those of their presbyters, gathered new churches in the neighbouring villages and hamlets; and these churches continuing under the protection and care of the bishops by whose ministry or procurement they had received Christianity, ecclesiastical provinces were gradually formed, which the Greeks afterward denominated *dioceses*. The persons to whom the city bishops committed the government and instruction of these village and rural churches, were called *rural bishops*, or *chorepiscopi*, [τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι, *episcopi rurales*, seu *villani*], i. e., bish-

(13) [The title of *angel* occurs only in the Apocalypse, a highly poetic book. It was not, probably, the *common* title of the presiding presbyter; and, certainly, was not an *older* title than that of *bishop*, which is so often used by St. Paul in his epistles, which were written long before the Apocalypse. See *Schlegel's* note here.—*Tr.*]

(14) [Dr. Mosheim, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M., p. 134, has a long note in which he argues from the traditional accounts of a longer catalogue of bishops in the church of

Jerusalem than in any other church during the first ages, that the church of Jerusalem must be supposed to have had bishops *earlier* than any other. Such reasoning is by no means conclusive.—*Tr.*]

(15) [All that is here stated, may be clearly proved from the records of the first centuries; and has been proved by Jos. Bingham, Origines Ecclesiast. W. Beve-ree, Codex Canon. primit. ecclesiæ, and others.—Mosheim, de Reb. Chr., &c., p. 136.—*Tr.*]

ops of the suburbs and fields. They were an intermediate class, between the bishops and the presbyters; being inferior to the former, [because subject to them], and superior to the latter, [because intrusted with discretionary and permanent power, and performing nearly all the functions of bishops].(16)

§ 14. All the churches, in those primitive times, were *independent* bodies; or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the apostles themselves, frequently had the honour shown them to be consulted in difficult and doubtful cases; yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is clear as the noonday, that all Christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality. Nor does there appear in this first century, any vestige of that *consociation* of the churches of the same province, which gave rise to *ecclesiastical councils*, and to *metropolitans*. But rather, as is manifest, it was not till the *second* century, that the custom of holding ecclesiastical councils first began in Greece, and thence extended into other provinces.(17)

§ 15. Among the Christian doctors and ecclesiastical writers, the first rank is most clearly due to the *apostles* themselves, and to certain disciples of the apostles, whom God moved to write histories of the transactions of *Christ* and his apostles. The writings of these men are collected into one volume, and are in the hands of all who profess to be Christians. In regard to the history of these sacred books,(18) and the arguments by which their divine authority and their genuineness are evinced,(19) those authors are to be consulted who have written professedly on these subjects.

§ 16. As to the time *when* and the persons *by whom* the books of the New Testament were collected into one body or volume, there are various opinions or rather conjectures of the learned: for the subject is attended with great and almost inexplicable difficulties, to us of these latter times.(20) It must suffice us to know, that before the middle of the *second* century

(16) [Learned men, who have written largely on the subject, have debated whether the *chorepiscopi* ranked with *bishops* or with *presbyters*. See *J. Morin*, de Sacris eccles. ordinatt., pt. i., excr. iv. *D. Blondel*, de Episc. et Presbyt., sec. iii. *W. Beve-rege*, Pandect. Canon., tom. ii., p. 176. *C. Ziegler*, de Episcopis, l. i., c. 13, p. 105, &c. *Peter de Marca*, de Concordia sacerdot. et imperii, l. ii., cap. 13, 14. *Bahmer*, Adnot. ad Petrum de Marca, p. 62, 63. *L. Thomassin*, Disciplina eccles. vet. et nova, pt. i., l. ii., c. 1, p. 215.—But they did not belong entirely to either of those orders.—*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante Const. M., p. 137.]

(17) It is commonly said, that the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, which is described Acts xv., was the *first Christian council*. But this is a perversion of the import of the term *council*. For that meeting was a conference of only a single church, called together for deliberation; and, if such meetings may be called *ecclesiastical councils*, a multitude of them were held in those primi-

tive times. An ecclesiastical council is a meeting of *delegates* from a number of *federate churches*.

(18) See, on this subject, *J. A. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, l. iv., c. v., p. 122–227, [and *Jer. Jones*, Method of settling the canonical authority of the N. T., 3 vols. 8vo; and the modern Introductions to the books of the N. T., in English, by *G. Horne*, and *J. D. Michaels*, ed. *Marsh*; and in German, by *Hornlin*, *Krug*, *Bertholdt*, *Eichhorn*, &c.—*Tr.*]

(19) The [early] writers in defence of the divine authority of the N. T. are enumerated by *J. A. Fabricius*, Delectus argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptor. pro verit. relig. Christianæ, cap. 26, p. 502. [On the subject itself, the modern writers are numerous, and generally known. *Lardner* and *Paley* still hold the first rank among the English.—*Tr.*]

(20) See *Jo. Ens*, Biblioth. Sacra, seu diatriba de Libror. N. T. canone, Amstel., 1710, 8vo; and *Jo. Mills*, Prolegom. ad N. T., sec. i., p. 23, &c.

had passed, most of the books composing the New Testament were in every Christian church throughout the known world; and they were read, and were regarded as the divine rule of faith and practice. And hence it may be concluded, that it was while some of the apostles were still living, and certainly while their disciples and immediate successors were everywhere to be met with, that these books were separated and distinguished from all human compositions.(21) That the *four Gospels* were combined, during the lifetime of the apostle *John*, and that the three first Gospels received the approbation of this inspired man, we learn expressly from the testimony of *Eusebius*.(22) And why may we not suppose, that the other books of the New Testament were collected into one body at the same time?

§ 17. There certainly were various causes, requiring this to be done at an early period; and particularly this, that not long after the Saviour's ascension, various histories of his life and doctrines, full of impositions and fables, were composed, by persons of no bad intentions perhaps, but who were superstitious, simple, and piously fraudulent; and afterwards, various other spurious writings were palmed upon the world, falsely inscribed with the names of the holy apostles.(23) These worthless productions

(21) See *Jo. Frick*, de Cura veteris ecclesiæ circa canon., cap. iii., p. 86, &c.

(22) *Euseb.*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., cap. 24.

(23) Such as remain of these spurious works, have been carefully collected by *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex Apocryphus N. Test., 2 vols. 12mo, p. 2006, Hamb., 2d ed., 1719. Many learned remarks on them occur in *Is. de Beausobre*, Histoire critique des dogmes de Manichée, liv. ii., p. 337, &c. [For the information of those who have not access to these spurious books, the following remarks are introduced. No one of all the books contained in the Codex Apocryphus N. T. of *Fabricius*, speaks disrespectfully of *Christ*, of his religion, his apostles and followers, or of the canonical books of the N. T. They were evidently composed with a design to subvert the cause of Christianity. They aim to supply deficiencies in the true Gospels and Acts, or to extend the history by means of oral traditions and supplementary accounts, professedly composed by apostles or by apostolic men. At least, this is true of those books which bear the title of Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. These were all designed, either, first, to gratify the laudable curiosity of Christians, and to subvert the cause of piety; or, secondly, to put to silence the enemies of Christianity, whether Jews or pagans, by demonstrating from alleged facts and testimony, that *Jesus* was the Messiah, his doctrines divine, his apostles inspired, &c.; or, lastly, to display the ingenuity of the writer, and to gratify the fancy by a harmless fiction. The only parts of this collection which do not seem to me to fall un-

der one or other of these classes, are such as by mistake, have been ascribed to the apostles and evangelists; such are the Liturgies, the Creed, and the Canons, which go under their names. Of those which are lost, no judgment can be formed but by testimony. Perhaps some of them were composed with hostile views towards the canonical scriptures.—The following account of the contents of the Codex Apocryphus N. T. may not be unacceptable or useless to many. On opening the first volume, we meet with (1) "The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," Latin, in 10 sections, p. 19–38.—(2) "The Previous Gospel, (Protevangeli-um), ascribed to *James* the Just, the brother of our Lord," Gr. and Lat., in 25 sect., p. 66–125.—(3) "The Gospel of the Infancy of Christ, ascribed to *Thomas* the apostle," Gr. and Lat., in 7 sect., p. 156–167.—(4) "The Gospel of the Infancy, translated from the Arabic, by *Henry Sikes*," Latin, in 55 sect., p. 168–211. It is the aim of all these to supply deficiencies in the beginning of the true Gospels, by acquainting us more fully with the history of the Virgin *Mary*, *Joseph*, *Elizabeth*, &c., and with the birth, infancy, and childhood of *Christ*.—Next follow (5) "The Gospel of *Nicodemus*," or, as it is sometimes called, "The Acts of *Pilate*," relating to the crucifixion and resurrection of *Christ*, Latin, in 27 sect., p. 238–298.—(6) Three "Epistles of *Pilate* to *Tiberius* the emperor," giving account of the condemnation, death, and resurrection of *Christ*, Latin, about 2 pages.—(7) "The Epistle of *Leontulus* to the Roman senate," describing the person and manners of *Christ*, Latin, one page.—The

would have worked great confusion, and would have rendered both the history and the religion of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of churches seasonably interposed, and caused the books which were truly divine and which came from apostolic hands, to be speedily separated from that mass of trash, and collected into a volume by themselves.

§ 18. Next after the apostles, *Clement*, the bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are, for the most part, uncertain.(24) There are still extant, *two epistles to the Corinthians*

three last, (No. 5, 6, 7), were intended to be valuable *appendages* to the true Gospels, and to contain irrefragable *proofs*, that *Jesus* was the Messiah, and clothed with divine authority.—Then follow, the writings ascribed to *Christ* himself; viz., his correspondence with *Abgarus*, king of Edessa; which is to be found in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 13, and in various modern works. These letters seem to have higher claims to authenticity, than any other pieces in this collection; and yet few, if any, of the judicious, will now admit them to be genuine.—*Fabricius* next gives a *catalogue* of about forty apocryphal Gospels, or of all the spurious Gospels, of which the slightest notice can be found in antiquity. These are all, of course, now lost, or buried in the rubbish of old libraries, except the few which are contained in the previous list.—Vol. i., pt. ii., begins with “The apocryphal *Acts* of the Apostles, or the history of their conflicts; ascribed to *Abdias*, the first bishop of Babylonia,” libri x, Latin, p. 402–742. This history summarily recounts what the canonical books relate of each of the 12 apostles, and then follows them severally through their various travels and labours, till their death or martyrdom. It was probably compiled in the middle ages, (it is first mentioned by *James*, a bishop of Geneva, in the 13th century), and by a monk, who was well acquainted with the ancient legendary tales, and who had good intentions; but who nevertheless was incompetent to distinguish what was true from what was false.—Then follows a catalogue of all the ancient biographies of individual apostles and apostolic men, which *Fabricius* could hear of; in all, 36 in number. Many of these were professedly compiled several centuries after the apostles were dead, and all of them that still remain are mere legends, of little or no value. Most of those that have been published, are to be met with in the Martyrologies and in the *Acta Sanctorum*.—*Fabricius* next gives us apocryphal *Epistles*, ascribed to the Virgin *Mary*, to *Paul*, and to *Peter*.—*Mary’s* letters are but *three*, and those very short. One is addressed to St. *Ignatius*, in 9 lines;

another, to the people of Marseilles, in 11 lines; and the third, to the people of Florence, in 4 lines. To St. *Paul* is attributed a short Epistle to the Laodiceans, Gr. and Lat. It is a tolerable compilation from his genuine epistles. Then follows a gentlemanly but rapid correspondence, in Latin; said to have passed between St. *Paul* and *Seneca*, the Roman philosopher. It comprises 14 short letters, full of compliments and of very little else.—*Paul’s* third Epistle to the Corinthians has not had the honour to be published.—There is one epistle of the apostle *Peter*, addressed to the apostle *James*, still extant in the Clementina, or spurious works of *Clemens Romanus*.—Of spurious *Revelations*, *Fabricius* enumerates *twelve*; most of which are either lost, or have not been judged worth publishing. The Shepherd of *Hermas* and the ivth book of *Esdras*, are the two best known, and the most valuable.—The 2d vol. of the Codex opens with the ancient *Liturgies*, going under the names of the apostles and evangelists. They are *six*; viz., those which bear the names of St. *James*, St. *Peter*, St. *John*, St. *Matthew*, and St. *Luke*; together with a short prayer, ascribed to St. *John*. These *Liturgies*, doubtless, are quite ancient. We may believe them to have been actually used by different churches, which supposed they were in accordance with the instructions of their favourite apostles.—To these *Liturgies* are subjoined *nine* Canons or ecclesiastical laws, said to have been adopted in a council of the apostles, held at Antioch; and finally, the Apostles’ Creed, which many of the ancients supposed, was formed by the apostles themselves.—The Appendix to the Codex gleans up some fragments and additional notices of the pieces before mentioned, and then closes with the Shepherd of *Hermas*, accompanied with notes.—*Tr.*]

(24) Subsequent to *Tillemont*, [*Memoires pour servir à l’histoire de l’Eglise*. tom. ii., pt. i., p. 279], *Cotelier*, [Patres Apostol.], and *Grabe*, [Spicileg. patrum. saec. i., p. 264. &c.], *Philip Rondininus* has collected all that is known of this great man, in the first of his two books, de S. Clemente, papa et

bearing his name, written in Greek ; of these, it is generally supposed that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver.(25) Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscreet person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in a production of so great a man.(26)

§. 19 The other works which bear the name of *Clement*, namely, the *apostolic Canons*, the *apostolic Constitutions*, the *Recognitions of Clement*, and the *Clementina* ; were fraudulently ascribed to this eminent father, by some deceiver, for the purpose of procuring them greater authority. This, all now concede.(27) The *apostolic Canons* are LXXXV *ecclesiastical Laws* ; and they exhibit the principles of discipline received in the Greek and Oriental churches, in the second and third centuries. The *VIII Books of apostolical Constitutions*, are the work of some austere and melancholy author, who designed to reform the worship and discipline of the church, which he thought were fallen from their original purity and sanctity, and who ventured to prefix the names of the apostles to his precepts and regulations, in order to give them currency.(28) The *Recog-*

martyre, ejusque Basilica in urbe Roma, Rome, 1706, 4to. [See also *Bouers' Lives of the Popes*, vol. i., p. 14–20, ed. 2d. Clemens was, perhaps, the person mentioned by *Paul*, Philip. iv., 3. He was one of the most distinguished Roman Christians, became bishop of Rome towards the close of the century, and is said to have lived till the third year of *Trajan's* reign, or about A.D. 100.—*Tr.*]

(25) The editions of *Clement's* epistles to the Corinthians are mentioned by *J. A. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, lib. iv., c. 5, p. 175, &c., to which must be added the edition of *Hen. Wotton*, Cantab., 1718, 8vo, which is preferable to the preceding editions, in many respects. [The English reader may find them both, together with some account of this author, in *Abp. Wake's* genuine epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, translated, &c. An ample account of them is given by *N. Lardner*, Credibility of the Gospel History, pt. ii., vol. i., p. 283, ed. Lond., 1815.—*Tr.*]

(26) See *J. B. Cotelier*, Patres Apostolici, tom. i., p. 133, 134, and *Edw. Bernhard*, Adnotatiunculæ ad Clementem, in the last edition of the Patres Apostol., by *J. le Clerc*. These annotations *H. Wotton* has in vain attempted to confute in his notes on the epistle of Clement.—[Besides the two epistles to the Corinthians, there are extant, in Syriac, two other epistles ascribed to *Clement*, entitled de Virginitate, seu ad Virgines. They were first brought to Europe by Sir *James Porter*, British ambassador at Constantinople ; and were published, with a Latin translation accompanying the Syriac text, by *J. J. Wetstein*, at the end of the 2d vol. of his very learned Gr. N. Testament, Lugd. Bat., 1752. Dr. *N. Lardner* assailed their genuineness in a Diss. of 60 pages, 8vo,

Lond., 1753, and *Herm. Venema* followed, in three printed letters, 1754. *Wetstein* replied to the former ; but dying in March, 1754, he left the controversy with the latter to *Andræ Galand*, who prosecuted it in his Bibliotheca vet. Patrum, dissert. ii., cap. ii. ; also in *Sprenger's* Thesaurus rei Patrisc., tom. i., p. 60, &c. These epistles are not mentioned by any writer till near the end of the fourth century. They were probably composed in the Oriental church, at the close of the second century, or in the third ; and for the double purpose of recommending celibacy, and reprehending the abuses of such a life. See *A. Næander's* Kirchengeschichte, vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1103, &c.—*Tr.*]

(27) For the history and various editions of these works, see *Thom. Ittig*, Diss. de Patribus Apostol., prefixed to his Bibliotheca Patrum Apostol., and his Diss. de Pseud-epigraphis Apostol., annexed to his Appendix ad Librum de Hæresiarchis ævi Apostol. ; also *J. A. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, l. v., cap. i., p. 31, &c. ; and l. vi., cap. i., p. 4, &c. [The best edition is that of *Cotelier*, republished by *Le Clerc*, 2 vols. fol., Amstel., 1724.—*Tr.*]

(28) The various opinions of the learned respecting the *apostolic canons and constitutions*, are collected by *J. F. Buddeus*, Isagoge in Theologiam, pt. ii., cap. v., p. 746. [See *Bp. Beveridge*, Notes on these Canons, and his Codex Canonum eccles. prim. vindic. et illustratus, Lond., 1678, 4to.—The canons themselves make a part of the Corpus Juris Canonici, and are also inserted in *Binius's* and other large histories of the councils. They are valuable documents respecting the order and discipline of the church, about the third century. The *apostolic constitutions* seem to have undergone changes

nitions of *Clement*, which differ but little from the *Clementina*, are ingenious and pretty fables; composed by some Alexandrine Jewish Christian and philosopher, of the *third* century, to meet the attacks of the Jews, Gnostics, and philosophers upon the Christian religion, in a new manner. A careful perusal of them, will assist a person much, in gaining a knowledge of the state of the ancient Christian church.(29)

§ 20. The *Apostolic Fathers* as they are called, are those Christian writers who were conversant either with the apostles themselves, or with their immediate disciples. Among these, the next after *Clement* was *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, a disciple and companion of the apostles. He suffered martyrdom under *Trajan*; being exposed to wild beasts, in the theatre at Rome.(30) There are extant several epistles bearing his name; and concerning which the learned have had long and sharp contests. The *seven*, written while he was on his way to Rome, as published A.D. 1646, by *J. Vossius*, from a Florentine MS., are by most writers accounted genuine; but the others are generally rejected as forgeries. To this opinion I cheerfully accede; and yet I must acknowledge, that the genuineness of the *epistle to Polycarp*, on account of its difference in style, appears to me very dubious; and indeed the whole subject of the Ignatian epistles in general, is involved in much obscurity and perplexity.(31)

since their first formation, and probably by Arian hands in the *fourth* century. They are voluminous and minute regulations, respecting ecclesiastical discipline and worship. They are of considerable use in determining various points of practice in the church, during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries.—*Tr.*]

(29) See *Mosheim's* Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia, in the first vol. of his *Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccl. pertinentes*, § 34, p. 174, &c. [The Apostolic Canons and Constitutions were ascribed to *Clement* as the collector and publisher only. The *Recognitions*, *Clementina*, &c., are ascribed to him as the author.—The writings belonging to this latter class, are *three* different works on the same subject, and written after the same general plan. They all, doubtless, had one and the same author, who rewrote his own work, for the sake of giving it a better form. The substance of them all, is, *Clement's* history of his own dissatisfaction with paganism; his first and slight knowledge of Christianity, which induced him to journey from Rome to Palestine; there he met with *Peter*, and for some time resided and travelled with him, heard his public discourses, and witnessed his combats, particularly with *Simon Magus*; and in private conversations with the apostles, everything pertaining not only to Christianity, but to cosmogony, physics, pneumatology, &c., was fully explained to him. The *three* works often relate precisely the same things, and in the same words; but they not unfrequently differ in the fulness

of the details, and in many of the minor points both of doctrine and of fact. The *first* is entitled *Sti Clementis Romani Recognitions*. The original is lost; so that we have only the Latin translation of *Rufinus*. It is divided into 10 books, and fills 111 large folio pages. The *second* is the *Clementina*, (*τα Κλημεντινα*), first published Gr. and Lat. by *Cotelier*, in 146 folio pages. It commences with an epistle of *Peter*, and another of *Clement*, addressed to the apostle *James*. The body of the work, instead of being divided into books and chapters like the *Recognitions*, is thrown into 19 discourses or homilies, (*ὁμιλίαι*), as delivered by *Peter*, but committed to writing by *Clement*. The *third* is the *Clementine Epitome*, or abridged account of the acts, travels, and discourses of *Peter*, together with the epistle of *Clement* to *James*, Gr. and Lat., 52 p. fol. This is, as its title implies, a mere abridgment of the two preceding works.—*Tr.*]

(30) See *Seb. de Tillemont*, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii., pt. ii., p. 42–80.

(31) In regard to these epistles, consult *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v., cap. i., p. 38–47. [*Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii., 36, makes very honourable mention of *Ignatius* and his epistles; and describes his conduct while on his way to Rome the place of his martyrdom. The account of his martyrdom, which is printed along with his epistles, gives a still fuller account of this eminent father. It is clear that he suffered death in the reign of *Trajan*; but whether A.D. 107 or 116 is uncertain. Rome was

§ 21. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom at an extreme age, in the middle of the second century. The epistle addressed to the Philippians, which is ascribed to him, is by some accounted genuine, and by others spurious: which of these are in the right, it is difficult to determine.(32) The *Epistle of Barnabas* as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century, [or the next], who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from *Barnabas*, the companion of *St. Paul*.(33) The book entitled the *Shepherd of Hermas*, (so called, because an *angel*, in the form and habit of a *shepherd*, is the leading character in the drama), was composed in the *second* century by *Hermas*, the brother of *Pius* the Roman bishop.(34) The writer, if he was indeed sane, deemed it proper to forge

the place of his martyrdom, and wild beasts his executioners. On his way from Antioch, he was enraptured with his prospect of dying a martyr, and wrote, probably, all his epistles. *Eusebius* says: "He confined the churches in every city through which he passed, by discourses and exhortations; warning them most especially, to take heed of the heresies, which then first sprung up and increased."—From Smyrna, (according to *Eusebius*), he wrote *four* of his epistles; viz., to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Trallis, and Rome. The last of these was, to entreat the Roman Christians not to interpose and prevent his martyrdom. From Troas he wrote *three* other epistles; viz., to the churches of Philadelphia and of Smyrna, and to his friend *Polycarp*. Of these *seven* epistles, there are duplicate copies still extant; that is, copies of a larger and of a smaller size. The latter are those which many suppose to be genuine. Besides these, there are extant *five* other Greek epistles, and as many more in Latin; which are now universally rejected: viz., *ad Mariam Cassibolitam*, *ad Tarsenses*, *ad Antiochenos*, *ad Heronem Antiochenum Diaconem*, *ad Phillipenses*; also, in Latin, one from the Virgin *Mary* to *Ignatius*, and his reply; two from *Ignatius* to *St. John*; and one of *Maria Cassibolita* to *Ignatius*.—It is the singular fortune of the seven first epistles of *Ignatius* to have become the subject of *sectarian* controversy among Protestants. In these epistles, the dignity and authority of *bishops* are exalted higher than in any other writings of this age. Hence, the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, prize and defend these epistles with no ordinary interest; while the reformed divines, and especially those of Holland, France, and Switzerland, assail them with equal ardour. The most prominent champions are Bishop *Pearson*, in his *Vindicia epistolarum Ignatii*, Cantabr, 1672, 4to, and *John Daillé*, de *Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areop. et Ignatii Antioch. no-*

minibus circumferuntur, Geneva, 1666, 4to. But each of these is supported by a host of able polemics. The truth is, that the *external* evidence, or that from ancient *testimony*, makes much for the genuineness of these epistles, though equally for the larger as for the smaller. The *internal* evidence is divided; and, of course, affords ground for arguments on both sides. Moderate men of various sects, and especially Lutherans, are disposed to admit the genuineness of the epistles in their shorter form; but to regard them as *interpolated* and altered. An English translation of them and of the martyrdom of *Ignatius*, may be seen in Archbishop *Wake's* genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers.—Tr.]

(32) Concerning *Polycarp* and his epistle, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii., pt. ii., p. 287, and *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, lib. v., cap. i., p. 47. [Also *W. Care*, *Life of Polycarp*, in his *Apostolici*, or, *Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, Lond, 1677, fol. The epistle of *Polycarp*, (the genuineness of which, if not certain, is highly probable), and the epistle of the church of Smyrna, concerning the martyrdom of *Polycarp*, (which few if any now call in question), are given in English, in Arch. *Wake's* Genuine epistles, &c. See *J. E. C. Schmidt*, *Handbuch der Kircheng.* Giessen, 1824, vol. i., p. 128, 424.—Tr.]

(33) Concerning *Barnabas*, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires*, &c., tome i., pt. iii., p. 1043. *Thom. Ittig*, *Selecta historiae eccles. capita*, sec. i., cap. i., § 14, p. 20, and *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, lib. iv., cap. v., § 14, p. 173, and lib. v., cap. i., § 4, p. 3, and various others. [This ancient monument of the Christian church, is likewise translated by Archbishop *Wake*, *Genuine Epistles*, &c. Its possible genuineness is maintained by *J. E. C. Schmidt*, ubi sup., vol. i., p. 416, &c.—but is confuted by *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1100, &c.—Tr.]

(34) This is now manifest from the very

dialogues held with God and angels, in order to insinuate what he regarded as salutary truths, more effectually into the minds of his readers. But his celestial spirits talk more insipidly, than our scavengers and porters. (35)

§ 22. All these writers of this first and infantile age of the church, possessed little learning, genius, or eloquence; but in their simple and unpolished manner they express elevated piety. (36) And this is honourable rather than reproachful to the Christian cause. For, that a large part of the human race should have been converted to *Christ* by illiterate and imbecile men, shows that the propagation of Christianity must be ascribed, not to human abilities and eloquence, but to a divine power.

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND RELIGION.

§ 1. The Nature and the Standard of the Christian Religion.—§ 2. Interpretation of the Scriptures.—§ 3. Mode of teaching Christianity.—§ 4. The Apostles' Creed.—§ 5. Distinction between Catechumens and the Faithful.—§ 6. Mode of instructing Catechumens.—§ 7. Instruction of Children; Schools and Academies.—§ 8. Secret Doctrine.—§ 9. Lives and Characters of Christians.—§ 10. Excommunication.—§ 11. Controversies among Christians.—§ 12. Contest about the Terms of Salvation.—§ 13. Judaizing Christians.

§ 1. THE whole of the Christian religion is comprehended in two parts; the one of which teaches *what we are to believe*, in regard to religious subjects; and the other, *how we ought to live*. The former is, by the apostles, denominated *the mystery* (μυστήριον), or *the truth* (ἀλήθεια); and the

ancient *Fragment of a Treatise on the Canon of the Holy Scriptures*, published a few years ago by *Lud. Antony Muratori*, (from an ancient MS. found at Milan), in his antiq. Italicar. medii. ævi, tom. iii., Diss. xliii., p. 853, &c. [But the genuineness and authority of this treatise itself, are now very much questioned by the learned; so that the true author of the Shepherd of Hermas is still unknown.—Tr.]

(35) For the best edition of *Hermas* we are indebted to *J. A. Fabricius*, who subjoined it to the third vol. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* He also treats of this writer in his *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v., cap. ix., § 9, p. 7. See also *Tho. Ittig*, de Patribus Apostolicis, § 55, p. 184, &c. [and in his *Selecta historiæ ecclæs. capita*, § 1, p. 65, and 155–179. The Shepherd of Hermas is translated by Archbishop *Wake*, *Genuine Epistles*, &c., and though wild and fanciful, yet, from the pious spirit which it breathes, and the insight it gives us into the speculations of the early Christians, it is not a useless book.—Tr.]

(36) The writers above named are denominated *the Apostolic Fathers*; and they are often published together. The best editions are by *J. Bapt. Cotelier*, Paris, 1672, re-edited by *J. le Clerc*, Antw., 1698, and again at Amsterd., 1724, 2 vols. fol., with numerous notes by both the editors and by others. [This last and best edition, Gr. and Lat., contains all that has been ascribed to the Apostolic Fathers, whether truly or falsely. The portions which Archbishop *Wake* regarded as genuine, he translated and published with a preliminary discourse of 136 pages, 2d ed. Lond., 1710, 8vo.—The value of the genuine works of these fathers, is to learned theology very small; but as affording us acquaintance with the true spirit and sentiments and reasonings of Christians in the very first ages after the apostles, they are of inestimable value.—If any one wishes to know what was the *simplicity and godly sincerity* of that first and infantile age of the church, let him read the Apostolic Fathers.—Tr.]

latter *godliness* or *piety* (ἐνσέβεια); 1 Timothy iii., 9; vi., 3; Titus i., 1. The rule and standard of both, are those books which God dictated to certain individuals, either before or after the birth of *Christ*. These books it has long been the custom to denominate *the Old* and *the New Testaments*.

§ 2. Provision therefore was early made, both by the apostles and their disciples, that these books should be in the hands of all Christians; that they should be publicly read in their assemblies; and be applied both to enlighten their minds with truth, and to advance them in piety. Those who expounded the Scriptures, studied simplicity and plainness. Yet it is not to be denied, that even in this century the perverse Jewish custom of obscuring the plain language of Scripture by forced and frigid allegories, and of diverting words from their natural and proper meaning in order to extort from them some recondite sense, found some admirers and imitators among Christians. Besides others, *Barnabas*, whose epistle is still extant, is proof of this.

§ 3. The manner of teaching religious truths was perfectly simple, and remote from all the rules of the philosophers, and all the precepts of human art. This is manifest, not only from the epistles of the apostles, but from all the monuments of this century which have come down to us. Nor did any apostle or any one of their immediate disciples, collect and arrange the principal doctrines of Christianity in a scientific or regular *system*. The circumstances of the times did not require this; and the followers of *Christ* were more solicitous to exhibit the religion they had embraced, by their tempers and their conduct, than to explain its principles scientifically, and arrange them according to the precepts of art.

§ 4. There is indeed extant, a brief summary of Christian doctrines, which is called the *Apostles' Creed*; and which, from the fourth century onward, was attributed to *Christ's* ambassadors themselves. But at this day, all who have any knowledge of antiquity, confess unanimously that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation.(1) Those judge far more wisely and rationally, who think that this creed arose from small beginnings, and was gradually enlarged as occasions required in order to exclude new errors from the church.(2)

(1) See *J. Fr. Buddens*, Isagoge ad Theologiam, l. ii., c. ii., § 2, p. 441, and *J. G. Walch*, Introduct. in libros symbolicos, l. i., cap. ii., p. 87, &c.

(2) This is shown, with no less learning than ingenuity, by *Peter King*, History of the Apostles' Creed; which *G. Olearius* translated into Latin, and published, Lips., 1704, 8vo. But those who read this book should be apprized, that the noble author often gives us conjectures instead of arguments; and that his conjectures do not always deserve to be implicitly received.—[Although the Apostles' Creed was not composed in a council of apostles, as was supposed in the days of *Rufinus* (*Ruf. de Symbola*); subjoined to *Cyprian's Opera*], yet it appears to have been the *general Creed of the Christian Church*, from, at least, the close of the second century down to the reformation. Nor did it undergo any very great or mate-

rial change; as appears from comparing the formulas of faith given by *Irenæus*, A.D. 175, (adv. Hær. i., 10, and iii., 4), and by *Tertullian*, A.D. 192, (*de Virgin. veland.*, cap. i.—contra *Praxeam*, cap. ii.—*Præscript.* adv. Hæret., cap. xiii.), with the forms of the Creed in all subsequent writers down to the present time. See these forms collected by *C. G. F. Walch*, in his *Bibliotheca symbolica vetus*, Lemgo, 1770, 8vo. Yet there were *some* variations in its form, as used by different churches; and *additions* were made to it from time to time.—Besides serving as the general test of Christian orthodoxy, the principal use of this creed, in the third and following centuries, was to guide catechists in training and instructing the catechumens in the principles of Christianity. See *Cyril of Jerusalem*, (*Catechesis*, passim), *Rufinus*, (*de Symbola*), and *Augustine*, (*Sermo i., ad Catechum.*, Opp., tom.

§ 5. At the first promulgation of the gospel, *all* who professed firmly to believe that *Jesus* was the only redeemer of mankind, and who promised to lead a holy life conformable to the religion he taught, were received immediately among the disciples of *Christ*: nor did a more full instruction in the principles of Christianity *precede their baptism*, but followed after it. But afterwards, when churches were everywhere established and organized, for very just reasons this custom was changed; and none were admitted to the sacred font unless previously well instructed in the primary truths of religion, and affording indubitable evidence of a sincere and holy character. And hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, or such as were in a course of instruction and discipline under the care of certain persons, and the *faithful*, who were admitted to all the mysteries, having been initiated and consecrated by baptism.(3)

§ 6. The instruction given to the catechumens was different, according to their genius and capacity. For those of feeble minds were instructed only in the more general and fundamental principles of religion; while those who appeared capable of grasping and comprehending all Christian knowledge, were instructed in every thing that could render a Christian stable and perfect according to the views of that age. The business of in-

vi., p. 399–405, ed. *Benedict*).—It is a most valuable monument of the church; because it shows what in the early ages were considered as the great, the peculiar, and the essential doctrines of the gospel; viz., those all important *facts* which are summarily recounted in this creed. The common form of it in the *fourth* century, as used in most churches in Europe, Asia, and Africa, except some slight verbal discrepancies, was the following.

In Greek. Πιστεω εις θεον (πατερα) παντοκρατορα. και εις χριστον Ιησεν, υιον αυτου τον μονογενη (μονογεννητον), τον κυριον ημων, τον γεννηθεντα εκ πνευματος αγιου και Μαρίας της παρθενης, τον επι Ποντιου Πιλατου ζαυροθεντα, (και) ταφεντα, (και) τη τριτη ημερα ανασαντα εκ (των) νεκρων, αναβαντα εις τας ωρανας, (και) καθημενον εν δεξια του πατρος, οθεν ερχεται κριναι (κρινειν) ζωντας και νεκρους. και εις (το) αγιον πνευμα, αγιαν εκκλησιαν, αφεσιν αμαρτιων, σαρκος αναστασιν.

In Latin. Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum filium ejus, Dominum nostrum: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine; crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dextram Patris; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum: sanctam ecclesiam; remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem.

In English. I believe in God, the Father, almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten son, our Lord, who was born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost, was

crucified under Pontius Pilate, buried, arose from the dead on the third day, ascended to the heavens, and sits at the right hand of the Father; whence he will come, to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit; the holy church; the remission of sins; and the resurrection of the body.

A few centuries later, it attained in the Romish church its ampler form, in which it has since been adopted by most Protestant churches: as follows. “I believe in God, the Father, almighty, maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ, his only son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he arose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father, almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.”

Besides those mentioned by *Mosheim*, the principal writers on this Creed, are *Cyril*, *Rufinus*, and *Augustine*, as above; and *G. J. Vossius*, (de *Tribus Symbolis*, Opp., tom. vi., p. 507, &c.) Archbishop *Usher*; (de *Rom. Eccles. aliisque Fidei Symbolis*); Bishop *Pearson*, (on the Creed); *C. Suicer*, (*Thesaur. Eccles. voce Σύμβολον*), and *J. Bingham*, *Antiq. Eccl.* lib. x.—*Tr.*]

(3) [See *J. Bingham*, *Orig. Eccles.*, lib. iii., cap. iv., and *Tob. Pfsunner*, de *Catechuminis veterum*, Vinariæ, 1688, 12mo.—*Tr.*]

structing those of superior capacity and genius, was committed to men of gravity and erudition in the larger churches. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flocks into two classes of persons, the one comprising such as received solid and thorough instruction, the other embracing the more ignorant. Nor do they conceal the fact, that different modes of teaching were adopted in reference to these two classes.(4)

§ 7. There can be no doubt, but that the children of Christians were carefully trained up from their infancy, and were early put to reading the sacred books and learning the principles of religion. For this purpose, *schools* were erected everywhere from the beginning. From these schools for children, we must distinguish those *seminaries* of the early Christians, erected extensively in the larger cities, at which adults and especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed and educated in all branches of learning both human and divine. Such seminaries, in which young men devoted to the sacred office were taught whatever was necessary to qualify them properly for it, the apostles of *Christ* undoubtedly both set up themselves and directed others to set up; 2 Timothy ii., 2. St. *John* at Ephesus, and *Polycarp* at Smyrna, established such schools.(5) Among these seminaries, in subsequent times, none was more celebrated than that at *Alexandria*; which is commonly called a *catechetical school*, and was said to be erected by St. *Mark*.(6)

§ 8. What many tell us, that the ancient Christians had their *popular* and their *secret* doctrines, and did not communicate to all classes the same instructions; may be admitted as true if it be rightly explained. For, those whom they would induce to embrace *Christ*, were not introduced at once to the high mysteries of religion which exceed the grasp of the hu-

(4) [See *Origen*, adv. Celsum, lib. iii., p. 143. The apostles themselves seem to have been the authors of this practice, of which we have vestiges, 1 Cor. iii., 2; Heb. v., 12.—*Schl.*]

(5) *Irenæus*, adv. Hær., l. ii., c. 22, p. 148, ed. Massuet. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. v., c. 20.—[The proofs referred to here and in the text, are quite insufficient to evince, that in the *first* century, or even in the former part of the *second*, Christians established *regular schools* for their children, and *academies* for their young men. *Paul's* direction to *Timothy*, (2 Epis., ii., 2), "The things thou hast heard of me,—the same *commit thou to faithful men*, who shall be able to teach others also;" seems to have no distinct reference to a *regular public school*, either for boys or young men. And the passages in *Irenæus* and *Eusebius* referred to, speak only of the *general instruction* and advantages, which the neighbouring *clergy* and others derived from the apostle *John*; and of the interesting *conversations* of *Polycarp*. If we consider the poverty and embarrassments of the first Christians, we can hardly suppose, they *could* have erected such schools and academies. And from the great penury of writers, and of learned men

of any sort, in the early church,—*Justin Martyr*, a converted philosopher in the middle of the second century, being the first learned writer after the apostles;—it seems most probable, that till past the middle of the *second* century, the means of education among Christians were very slender; and by no means so general and so ample as Dr. *Mosheim* supposes.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *J. A. Schmidt*, Diss. de schola catechet. Alexandr., prefixed to the tract of *A. Hyprius*, de Catechesi; also *Dom. Ausilius*, delle Scuole sacre, lib. ii., c. i., ii., p. 5–17, and c. xxi., p. 92, &c. Concerning the larger schools of Christians in the East, at Edessa, Nisibis, Seleucia, and concerning the ancient Christian schools in general, see *J. S. Asseman*, Biblioth. orient. Clem. Vat., tom. iii., p. ii., p. 914–919.—[The ancient tradition, preserved by *Jerome*, (de Scriptor. Illustr., cap. 36), that *St. Mark* was the founder of the catechetical school at Alexandria, deserves but little credit; since all antiquity is silent respecting a Christian school there, or any teacher, or student, in it, till the days of *Pantænus* and his pupil *Clemens Alex.*, near the close of the *second* century. See *Schroecckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. iii., p. 188, &c.—*Tr.*]

man mind, but were first instructed in the doctrines which reason can comprehend, till they were able to bear the more sublime and difficult truths. And afterward, those who ranked among believers, were not all instructed in the same manner; but one was directed to study and treasure up in his mind more or fewer things than another. Whoever would understand more than this by the *secret doctrine* of the first century, should beware lest he confound the faults of subsequent ages with the excellences of this.(7)

§ 9. Most authors represent the lives and morals of Christians in this age, as patterns of purity and holiness, worthy of the imitation of all subsequent ages. This representation, if it be understood of the *greater part* of the professed Christians, and not of *all*, is undoubtedly true. But whoever supposes the primitive churches were perfectly free from all vices and sins, and estimates the lives of *all* the Christians by the conduct of some of them, and by the precepts and exhortations of their teachers, as most of those writers have done whose books and tracts concerning the innocence and holiness of the early Christians are extant; may be confuted by the clearest evidence of both testimony and facts.(8)

§ 10. The visible purity of the churches was much promoted, by that law which deprived of ordinances and excluded from the community persons of vile character, or who were known to be vicious; provided they would not reform on being admonished. Such a law, we know was established by the apostles, soon after churches began to be formed.(9) In the application and enforcement of this law, the teachers and rulers generally pointed out the persons who seemed to merit exclusion from the church, and the people sanctioned or rejected the proposal at their discretion. Excluded sinners, although they had committed the highest offences, if they gave satisfactory evidence of penitence for their faults, and of their leading better lives in future, were allowed to return to the church, at least in most places; yet but once only. For those who were restored, if they returned to their former bad practices, and were again excluded from the brotherhood, had no more a prospect of forgiveness.(10)

(7) Concerning this *secret doctrine*, much is collected by *Chr. Matt. Pfaff*, Diss. posterior de Præjudiciis Theolog., § 13, p. 149, &c., in his *Primitia Tubingensia*.

(8) [For a knowledge of the state of piety and morals among the Christians of the first century, we are dependant nearly altogether on the Holy Scriptures: for all the apostolic fathers, except *Clement*, lived and wrote in the second century. Besides, their writings state very few facts, and acquaint us with almost nothing, except what relates to the views and feelings of the writers themselves. *Clement* wrote upon occasion of a broil in the church of Corinth; and he aims to set home *Paul's* exhortations to them on former occasions. From the N. T., and especially from *Paul's* epistles, we learn many things respecting the state of morals and piety among Christians, from the first planting of the churches till about A.D. 68. And from the Apocalyptical epistles, we learn the state

of religion in the seven churches of Asia about A.D. 96. Judging from these representations, it would seem that the characters of the Christians of that age, presented a singular combination of excellences and defects; that, in some respects, they were indeed patterns for all after ages; but, in other respects, and especially certain churches, as Corinth, Galatia, Sardis, and Laodicea, by no means deserved imitation.—*Tr.*]

(9) [See 1 Cor. v.] For the discussions that have taken place respecting this law, see *Chr. Matt. Pfaff*, de Origibus Juris Ecclesiast., p. 10, 13, 71, 98.

(10) See *Jo. Morin*, Commentar. de disciplina pœnitentiæ, lib. ix., cap. 19, p. 670, and others. [*Natal. Alexander*, Hist. Eccles. N. T., sæc. iii., diss. vii.; and *J. Aug. Orsi*, Dis. qua ostenditur, cathol. ecclesiam tribus prior. sæculis capital. crim. reis pacem et absolut. nequitiam denegasse, Milan, 1730, 4to. But all these writers

§ 11. As the Christian churches were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, between whom there had been an inveterate aversion, and as those recent Christians retained many erroneous impressions, received and cherished from their infancy, it could not be but that various disagreements and contests would early arise among them. The first of these contests related to the necessity of observing the law of *Moses*. It broke out in the church of Antioch; and its issue is stated by *Luke*, Acts xv. This controversy was followed by many others; partly with Jewish Christians, too much attached to their national religion; partly with persons captivated with a species of fanatical philosophy; and partly with some who abused the Christian doctrines, which they ill understood, to the gratification of their appetites and lusts. (11) *St. Paul* and the other apostles, often mention these controversies; but so cursorily and concisely, that we can hardly ascertain the exact points controverted.

§ 12. Of all these contests, the greatest and most important seems to have been, that relating to the way of attaining to justification and salvation, which Jewish teachers excited at Rome and in other Christian churches. For while the apostles everywhere inculcated, that all hopes of justification and salvation should be placed solely on *Jesus Christ* and his merits, these Jewish teachers ascribed to the law and to the works which *Christ* enjoined, the chief influence in procuring everlasting happiness. This error not only led on to many others, which were prejudicial to the religion of *Christ*, but was connected with the highest dishonour to the Saviour. For they who maintained that a life regulated according to the law, would give a title to eternal rewards, could not hold *Christ* to be the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind; but merely a prophet, or a divine messenger among men. It cannot therefore appear at all strange, that *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the Romans and elsewhere, took so much pains to extirpate this capital error.

§ 13. The controversy respecting the necessity of the Mosaic rites in order to salvation, was wisely decided by the apostles, Acts xv. But great as the apostolic influence was, that deep-rooted love of the Mosaic law which was handed down from their fathers, could not be wholly eradicated from the minds of the Jewish Christians, and especially of those living in Palestine. It diminished a little, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the prostration of the temple by the Romans; yet it did not wholly subside. Hence it was, as we shall see hereafter, that a part of the Jewish Christians separated from the other brethren, and formed a distinct sect attached to the law of *Moses*.

describe rather the practice of the second and third centuries, than that of the first.—*Tr.*]

(11) Conducive to the illustration of these controversies, are the investigations of *Herm. Witsius*, *Miscellanea Sacra*, tom. ii., exerc. xx., xxi., xxii., p. 668, &c. *Camp. Vitringa*, *Observatt. sacræ*, lib. iv., c. ix., x.,

xi., p. 952. [*J. F. Buddens*, *Ecclesia Apostolica*; and, still better, *Ch. W. Fr. Walch*, *Vollständige Historie der Ketzereien*, Spaltungen, u. s. f., vol. i., p. 68, &c.; and *A. Neander*, *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christl. Kirche durch die Apostel*, Hamb., 1832.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Baptism and the Lord's Supper appointed by Christ.—§ 2. Rites instituted by the Apostles.—§ 3. The Jewish Rites retained.—§ 4. Public Assemblies of Christians, and Times for Meeting.—§ 5. Places of Meeting.—§ 6. Mode of Worship.—§ 7. Lord's Supper and Agapae.—§ 8. Baptism.—§ 9. Anointing the Sick.—§ 10. Fasting

§ 1. **ALTHOUGH** the Christian religion has the greatest simplicity, and requires nothing but faith and love; yet it could not wholly dispense with external rites and institutions. Jesus himself established but *two* rites, which it is not lawful either to change or to abrogate; viz., *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*. Yet these are not to be considered as mere ceremonies, or as having only a symbolical import; but as having also a sanctifying influence on the mind. That he chose to establish no more rites, ought to convince us, that ceremonies are not essential to the religion of *Christ*; and that the whole business of them, is left by him to the discretion and free choice of Christians.

§ 2. Many considerations leave us no reason to doubt, that the friends and apostles of the Saviour, sanctioned in various places the use of other rites; which they either tolerated from necessity, or recommended for good and solid reasons. Yet we are not to suppose that they have anywhere inculcated and established any permanent system of clerical rights and prerogatives; nor that they prescribed the same rites and forms in all churches. On the contrary, various things go to show, that Christian worship was from the beginning regulated and conducted differently, in different places; and this, no doubt, with the approbation of the apostles and their coadjutors and disciples; and that in this whole matter, much regard was shown to the former opinions, customs and laws of different nations. (1)

(1) [It appears that even so late as the third and fourth centuries, there was considerable difference in the mode of conducting religious worship among Christians. See *Irenaeus*, quoted by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., cap. 24. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., cap. 19. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., cap. 22. *Augustine*, Epist. 54, Opp., tom. ii., p. 93. A part of this difference in rites and ceremonies, appears to have come down from the apostolic times. For when a contest arose in the second century, between the Oriental and the Occidental Christians, respecting the day on which Easter should be observed; we are informed by *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccl., l. v., cap. 23, 24), that the former maintained, that *John* was the author of their custom; and the latter, that *Peter* and *Paul* were the authors of theirs. Both churches were probably correct; for it is

very probable that *John*, for certain reasons, did ordain in Asia, that the feast of Easter should be kept at the time the Jews kept it; and that *Peter* and *Paul* ordered otherwise at Rome. Further, the Greek and Latin churches had a contest on the question, whether *leavened* or *unleavened* bread should be used in the sacred supper. And both churches claimed to have their customs handed down to them from the apostles; and, for the reasons before mentioned, both were probably in the right.—Even the Catholics often admit this diversity of ceremonies in the apostolic church; e. g., *Jo. Bona*, *Rerum Liturg.*, l. i., c. 7, § 2, Opp., p. 208, and the Jesuit *Jo. Harduin*, makes no scruple to assert that *Paul* enjoined on the Greeks *one* form for the consecration of priests; and *Peter* on the Romans another. His book is entitled: *La Dissertation du P.*

§ 3. I am therefore induced to dissent from those, who think that the Jewish rites and forms were *everywhere* transferred by the apostles and their disciples to the Christian assemblies. In those churches, indeed, which were composed either wholly or principally of Jews, I can easily believe, the Jewish rites were so far retained as the different characters of the two religions would permit. And this may be evinced by a good many examples. But that the same took place in other churches, in which either no Jews or only a few were found, is not merely uncertain, but incredible. Because it was proper that the rituals of those early times should be variously modelled, according to the peculiarities of genius and character in different nations.

§ 4. As there was diversity in the practice of Christians, it will be very difficult to make statements relative to their mode of worship and other customs and regulations, which will be equally applicable to *all* the countries in which Christianity flourished. Yet there are a few regulations which may be considered as common to all Christians; and of these, we shall give a brief account.—The Christians of this century, assembled for the worship of God and for their advancement in piety, on the *first day of the week*, the day on which *Christ* reassumed his life; for that this day was set apart for religious worship by the apostles themselves, and that, after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed, we have unexceptionable testimony.(2) Moreover, those congregations which either lived intermingled with Jews, or were composed in great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the *seventh day* of the week, as a sacred day:(3) for doing which the other Christians taxed them with no wrong.—As to *annual* religious days, they appear to have observed *two*; the one, in memory of *Christ's* resurrection; the other, in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles.(4) To these may be added, those days on which holy men met death for *Christ's* sake; which, it is most probable, were sacred and solemn days, from the very commencement of the Christian church.(5)

le Courayer sur la succession des Evesques Anglois et sur la validité de leur ordination, réfutée, tom. ii., p. 13. Paris, 1725, 8vo, fadd *A. Krazer*, de Apostolicis, nec non antiquis eccl. occident. Liturgiis, sect. i., cap. i., § 2, p. 3, ed. Augustæ Vind., 1786.] See *Moshem's* Institut. majores hist. Christ, p. 375.—*Schl.*]

(2) *Ph. J. Hartmann*, de Rebus gestis Christianor. sub Apostolis, cap. xv., p. 387. *J. Hen. Böhmcr*, Diss. i., Juris eccl. antiqui de stato die Christianor., p. 20, &c. [See, also, Acts xx., 7; ii., 1; 1 Cor. xvi., 1, 2; Apoc. i., 10. *Pliny*, Epist., lib. x., ep. 97, n. 7.—*Schl.*]

(3) *Steph. Curcellacus*, Diatriba de esu sanguinis; Opp. Theol., p. 958. *Gabr. Albaspinacus*, Observat. Eccles., lib. i., obs. xiii., p. 53. In vain some learned men labour to persuade us, that in *all* the early churches *both* days, or the *first and last* days of the week, were held sacred. The churches of Bithynia, mentioned by *Pliny*,

devoted but *one stated day* to their public worship; and, beyond all controversy, that was what we call the *Lord's day*, or the first day of the week.

(4) Although some have doubted whether the day called *Pentecost* (*Whitsunday*) was a sacred day so early as the first century, (see *J. Bingham*, Origines Eccles., lib. xx., cap. 6)—yet I am induced, by very weighty reasons, to believe that, from the beginning, it was held equally sacred with the *Passover* (or *Easter day*). Perhaps, also, (*Good Friday*), the *Friday* on which our Saviour died, was, from the earliest times, regarded with more respect than other days of the week. See *J. Gothofred*, in Codicem Theodos., tom. i., p. 138. *Asseman*, Biblioth. orient. Vatican., tom. i., p. 217, 237. *Martene*, Thesaur. Anecdotor., tom. v., p. 66.

(5) [These were called *natalitia martyrum* (the *martyrs' birthdays*). See *Casp. Sagittarius*, de Natalitiis martyrum, republished by *Crenius*, syntagma i., diss. philol.,

§ 5. The *places* of assembling were, undoubtedly, the private dwelling-houses of Christians. But as necessity required that when a congregation was formed and duly regulated, some fixed uniform place for its meetings should be designated; and as some furniture was requisite for their accommodation, such as books, tables, and benches, which could not conveniently be transported from place to place, especially in those perilous times; it was undoubtedly the case, that the place of their assemblies soon became, instead of a private room, a sort of public one. (6) These few remarks, I conceive, are sufficient to determine that long controversy, *whether the early Christians had temples or not?* (7) If the word *temple* may denote a dwelling-house, or even a part of one, which is devoted to the public exercises of religion, yet without any idea of holiness attached to it, and which is not separated from all profane or secular uses; then I can readily admit, that the earliest Christians had temples.

§ 6. In these public assemblies of Christians, the holy scriptures were read; which, for that purpose, were divided into portions or lessons. Then followed an exhortation to the people, neither eloquent nor long, but full of warmth and love. If any signified that they were moved by a divine afflatus, they were allowed successively to state what the Lord commanded; the other *prophets* who were present judging how much authority was due to them, 1 Cor. xiv., 16. Afterwards, the prayers which constituted no inconsiderable part of public worship, were recited after the bishop. (8) To these succeeded hymns; which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by certain persons, during the celebration of the sacred supper and the feasts of charity. The precise order and manner of performing all these parts of religious worship, in the various Christian churches, cannot be fully ascertained; yet it is most probable, that no one of these exercises was wholly omitted in any church. (9)

§ 7. The prayers of Christians were followed by *oblations* of bread, wine, and other things, for the support of the ministers of the church and the poor. For every Christian who had any thing to spare, brought his gift and offered it in a sense to the Lord. (10) From these gifts, so much bread and wine as were requisite for the Lord's supper, were set apart, and consecrated by prayers offered solely by the bishop, to which the people responded *amen*. (11) The distributors of the sacred supper were the *deacons*.

1699. In the *second* century these natalitia were everywhere observed; and they are often mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*. And in the epistle of the church of Smyrna to Philomelius, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., c. 15, the observance of the day of *Polycarp's* martyrdom is mentioned. —*Schl.*]

(6) See *Camp. Vitringa*, de Synagoga vetere, l. i., pt. iii., cap. i., p. 432. [It may be inferred from Acts xix., 8; 1 Cor. xi., 22; xiv., 35, and Ja. ii., 2, that Christians then had certain determinate places for holding public worship. —*Schl.*]

(7) See *Dav. Blondell*, de Episcopis et Presbyt., sect. iii., p. 216, 243, 246. *Just. Hen. Böhmer*, Diss. ii., Juris eccles. antiq. de Antelucanis Christianorum cœtibus, § iv., p.

39. *Jos. Bingham*, Origines Eccles., lib. viii., ch. i., and others.

(8) See *Justin Martyr*, Apologia secunda, p. 98, &c.

(9) This must be understood of the churches that were fully established and regulated. For in the nascent churches, which had not become duly regulated, I can believe one or other of these exercises might be omitted.

(10) See *Christ. Matt. Pfaff*, Dissertt. de oblatione et consecratione Eucharistica; in his Syntagma Dissertt. Theolog., Stuttgart, 1720, 8vo.

(11) *Justyn Martyr*, Apologia Secunda, p. 98, &c. The writers on the ceremonies of the sacred supper, are mentioned by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliograph. antiquaria, cap. xi., p. 395, &c.

This most holy ordinance was followed by sober repasts, which, from their design, were denominated *agapae*, feasts of charity.(12) The various difficulties which occur in the accounts respecting these feasts, will, undoubtedly, be solved with ease, by admitting that the earliest Christians were governed by different rules, and did not everywhere celebrate either this or other institutions in the same manner.

§ 8. In this century *baptism* was administered in convenient places, without the public assemblies; and by immersing the candidates wholly in water.(13) At first, all who were engaged in propagating Christianity, administered this rite: nor can it be called in question, that whoever persuaded any person to embrace Christianity, could baptize his own disciple. But when the churches became more regulated, and were provided with rules of order, the *bishop* alone exercised the right of baptizing all the new converts to Christianity; though in process of time, as the limits of his church were enlarged, he imparted this right to the *presbyters* and *chor-episcopi*; reserving however the *confirmation* of those baptisms which were administered by presbyters.(14) As to the ceremonies, which in this early period were superadded to baptism for the sake of order and decency, we are not able to say any thing with certainty; nor do we think it safe to estimate the rules of that age, by the customs of subsequent times.

§ 9. The Grecian Christians, when dangerously sick, sent for the elders of the church, agreeably to Ja. v., 14; and after the sick man had confessed his sins, the elders commended him to God in devout supplication, and anointed him with oil. Many things in regard to this rite, may be, and have actually been, subjects of controversy. But the silence of the ancient writers, prevents our coming to any certain conclusions. For though there is no reason to doubt that this rite prevailed extensively among Christians, yet it is rarely mentioned in the writings of the ancients.(15)

§ 10. No law was enacted by *Christ* and his apostles concerning *fasts*; but the custom obtained, that most Christians occasionally and privately joined abstinence from their food with their prayers; and especially when engaged in undertakings of great importance, 1 Cor. vii., 5. How much time a man should spend in this exercise, was left to the private judgment of each individual; nor did a person expose his character at all, if he thought it sufficient for *him* to observe only the rules of strict temperance.(16) Of

(12) The writers concerning the *agapae*, are mentioned by *Tho. Ittig*, *Selecta Histor. Eccles. capita*, saecul. ii., cap. iii., p. 180, &c., and *Christ. Matt. Pfaff*, *de Originibus Juris Eccles.*, p. 68.

(13) See *Ger. Jo. Vossius*, *de Baptismo*, disp. i., thes. vi., p. 31, &c., and the authors recommended by *J. A. Fabricius*, *Bibliogr. Antiquar.*, cap. xi., § xxv., p. 389, &c.

(14) These remarks, I conceive, go to elucidate and determine the questions so strenuously debated among the learned, concerning the *right of administering baptism*. See *Just. Hen. Boehmer*, *Diss.* xi., *Juris eccles. antiqui*, p. 500, &c. *Jo. le Clerc*, *Biblioth. universelle et historique*, tome iv., p. 93, &c.

(15) Most of the ancient testimonies con-

cerning this custom, are collected by *Jo. Launoi*, *de Sacramento unctionis infirmorum*, cap. i., p. 444, *Opp.*, tom. i. Among these passages, very few are to be found in the writers of the *first* centuries; yet there is here and there one, which has escaped the notice of this very learned man. [The principal writers on this subject, are mentioned by *J. C. Wolf*, *Curae Philol. et Crit.*, tom. iv., on Ja. v., 14.—*Tr.*]

(16) *Shepherd of Hermas*, lib. iii., Similit. v., p. 931, 935, ed. Fabricii, at the close of vol. iii. of his *Codex Apocryph. N. T.* [The best writer on this subject, is *John Duillé*, *de Jejunio et Quadragesimo*, Davenport, 1654, 8vo, against whom, however, *Beccerje* brings some objections, in *Codex Canon. vind.*—*Schl.*]

any solemn *public* fasts, except only on the anniversary day of the crucifixion of *Christ*, there is no mention in the most ancient times. Gradually, however, days of fasting were introduced; first by custom, and afterwards by legal sanction. Whether any thing of this nature occurred in the *first* century, and what days were devoted to fasting, we have not the means of deciding. And yet I would not deny, that very specious arguments are adduced by those who think, that while the apostles were still living, or soon after their decease, the Christians in most places abstained from food, either wholly or partially, on the fourth and on the sixth days of the week.(17)

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Sects sprung up in the very Times of the Apostles.—§ 2. They gradually increased.—§ 3. Sect of the Gnostics.—§ 4. It originated from the Oriental Philosophy.—§ 5. They occasioned various Errors in regard to the Holy Scriptures and other Subjects.—§ 6. Gnostic Opinions concerning *Christ*.—§ 7. Their Moral Doctrines.—§ 8. How they supported their Doctrines.—§ 9. Causes of Disagreement among themselves.—§ 10. Dositheus.—§ 11. Simon Magus was not a *Heretic*.—§ 12. His History.—§ 13. His Doctrines.—§ 14. Menander.—§ 15. Whether there was a Sect of Nicolaitans.—§ 16. Cerinthus, and the Cerinthians.—§ 17. Nazareans and Ebionites, properly belong to the Second Century.

§ 1. CHRISTIAN churches had scarcely been gathered and organized, when here and there men rose up, who, not being contented with the simplicity and purity of that religion which the apostles taught, sought out new inventions, and fashioned religion according to their own liking. This appears, from various passages in the epistles left us by the apostles, and particularly from *Paul's* epistles. For in these, there is frequent mention of persons, who either endeavoured to mould the Christian doctrines into conformity with that philosophy or *γνῶσις*,(1) to which they were addicted; or who were disposed to combine with Christianity Jewish opinions, customs, and institutions. Several of these corrupters of religion are likewise expressly named; as *Hymenaeus* and *Alexander*, *Philetus*, *Hermogenes*, *Phygellus*, *Demas*, and *Diotrephes*.(2) If, however, from this list, *Alexander*, *Hymenaeus*, and *Philetus* be excepted, the others appear to be, rather apostates from the *practice* of religion, than corrupters of its *principles*.(3)

(17) See *Wil. Beverege*, Codex Canon. vindic., tom. ii., Patr. Apostol., p. 166.

(1) 1 Tim. vi., 20, and ch. i., 3, 4; Tit. iii., 9; Coloss. ii., 8.

(2) [Concerning *Diotrephes*, there is a particular tract by *Stemler*, 1758.—*Schl.*]

(3) 2 Tim. ii., 18, and elsewhere. See also the elaborate discussions concerning these men, by *Camp. Vitringa*, *Observ. Sacrae*, lib. iv., cap. ix., p. 952. *Thomas Ittig*, de *Haeresiarchis aevi Apostol.*, sect. i., cap.

viii., p. 84. *J. Fr. Buddeus*, de *Ecclesia Apostolica*, cap. v., p. 292, &c.—[As to *Hymenaeus* and *Philetus*, we are informed by *St. Paul*, 2 Tim. ii., 17, 18, comp., 1 Tim. i., 19, 20, not only in general, that they had swerved from sound doctrine; but their particular error is pointed out. They taught that a resurrection of the dead was no longer to be anticipated, it being already passed; and they laboured to make proselytes to this opinion. See *J. G. Walch*,

§ 2. So long as the greater part of the apostles were alive, to watch over the churches, these innovators were not very successful, and seem to have had no great number of followers. But gradually, they acquired more influence; and before the decease of all those whom *Christ* had himself instructed, they laid the foundations of those sects, which afterwards exceedingly disturbed the Christian community and gave rise to so many contests. The history of these sects is very obscure; indeed, the most obscure part of ecclesiastical history. This obscurity arises, partly from the deficiency of ancient records; partly, from the tenets of these sects, which for the most part were singularly caliginous and remote from common apprehension; and partly, from the ignorance and hostility of those who have written concerning them. This however is perfectly clear, that no one who loves the truths which the Bible inculcates, can find any thing to commend in the peculiarities of these sects.(4)

§ 3. At the head of all the sects which disturbed the peace of the church, stand the Gnostics; who claimed ability to restore to mankind the lost knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of the true and supreme God; and who announced the overthrow of that empire, which the creator of the world and his associates had set up. It is, indeed, the common opinion, and supported by the testimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (*Stromat.*, l. vii., c. 17., p. 898, 899,) that the Gnostic sects first arose *after the decease of the apostles*, in the reign of *Adrian*; and that previously, no discords had produced separations from the church. But the sacred scriptures themselves—to say nothing of other ancient documents—put it beyond controversy, that even in the *first* century, in various places, men infected with the Gnostic leprosy began to erect societies distinct from the other Christians; 1 John

Exercit. de Hymenaeo et Phileto; in his *Miscell. Sacra.*, lib. i., p. 81, &c.—As to *Alexander*, it is still contested whether the *Alexander* in 1 Tim. i., 20, and 2 Tim. iv., 14, and in Acts ix., 33, be one and the same person. The greater part believe the affirmative. But *Heumann*, (*Expos. of the New Test.*, vol. vi., p. 363), and *Dr. Mosheim*, (*Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante C. M.*, p. 178), support the negative; being inclined to believe that there were two persons of this name. The younger *Walch*, (*Entwurf der Ketzereyen*, p. 127), prefers abiding by the common opinion.—*Hermogenes* and *Phygelus* are accused by Paul, 2 Tim. i., 15, of only having forsaken him when he was imprisoned at Rome, which was *inconstancy*, but not *heresy*.—As to *Demas*, Paul tells us, 2 Tim. iv., 10, that, from love to the world, he had forsaken him. But this gives no ground for charging him with being a *heretic*.—*Diotrephes*, mentioned in the 3d Ep. of *John*, is accused of a twofold fault; viz., refusing to receive those whom the apostle recommended to his kind offices; and setting himself in opposition to the apostle. But neither of these offences is sufficient to constitute him a heretic.—*Schl.*]

(4) Professed histories of the sects which arose in this and the next century have been

written; by *Thom. Ittig*, de Haeresiarchis aevi Apostolici et Apostolico proximi, Lips., 1690, 4to, and an Appendix, Lips., 1696, 4to; by *Renatus Massuetus*, Dissert. Irenaeo praemissae; and by *Sebast. le Nain de Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise. But all these, and others whom I pass over, have rather collected materials for a history of these sects, than written the history itself. Among the Lutherans *Abr. Hinckelmann*, *Ja. Thomasius*, *Jo. Hen. Horbicus*, and among the Reformed *Ja. Basnage* and *Henry Dodwell* have either promised the world such a history or attempted to write it; but have done no more. We must therefore still wait for some person of adequate sagacity, fairness, and skill in ancient philosophy and literature to accomplish this difficult undertaking. [This has been since attempted by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereyen, &c., 11 vols. 8vo, 1762–85. *N. Lardner*, Hist. of the Heretics, Lond., 1780, 4to. *F. A. Leicard*, de Doctrina Gnostica, Heidelberg, 1818, 8vo. *A. Neander*, Genetische Entwicklung d. vornehmsten gnost. Systeme, Berlin, 1818, 8vo, and still better, in his *Algem. Gesch. der Chr. Relig. u. Kirche*, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 602–859.—*Tr.*]

ii., 18; 1 Tim. vi., 20; Col. ii., 8.(5) Yet these stray flocks did not become distinguished for their numbers, or for their fame and notoriety, till the times of *Adrian*. Under the appellation of Gnostics, are included all those in the first ages of the church, who modified the religion of *Christ*, by joining with it the Oriental philosophy, in regard to the source of evil, and the origin of this material universe. The leading principles of this philosophy, have already been stated.

§ 4. All those eastern philosophers, believing that rational souls became connected with matter and the inhabitants of bodies, contrary to the will and pleasure of the supreme God, where in expectation of a mighty legate from the Deity, possessed of consummate wisdom and power; who would imbue, with a knowledge of the true God, the spirits now oppressed with the load of their bodies, and rescue them from their bondage to the lords of this material world. When therefore some of them perceived, that *Jesus* and his friends wrought miracles of a salutary character, they were ready to believe that *Jesus* was that mighty legate of God, come to deliver men from the power of the Genii who governed this lower world, and to rescue souls from their unhappy connexion with material bodies. This supposition being admitted into minds polluted with gross errors, they interpreted or rather perverted *whatever Christ* and his disciples taught, so as to make it harmonize with their *other* opinions.

§ 5. Hence there necessarily arose among them a multitude of opinions, which were extremely foreign from the precepts of *Christ*. Their belief, that the world was not created by the supreme God in whom is all perfection, but by one or more inferior deities of a bad or at least of an imperfect character, would not allow them to admit the divine authority of the O. T. scriptures; and it led some of them to venerate and extol the *serpent*, the prime author of sin among men, and likewise several of the vilest persons mentioned in the Jewish scriptures. The same belief induced them to condemn *Moses*, and the religion he taught; and to represent him as instigated to impose such hard and unsuitable laws on the Jews, by the world's Creator, who had no regard for human happiness, but only for his own glory and authority. Their belief that *matter* is eternal and the source of all evil, prevented them from putting a due estimate upon the human body; and from favouring marriage, whereby bodies are produced; and also from admitting the doctrine of the future resurrection of the body. Their belief, that malevolent genii ruled over the world, and that from them originated all the diseases, wars, and calamities of men, led them, almost universally, to addict themselves to *magic*, or the art of weakening and paralyzing the power of those genii. I omit many other points, as not compatible with so summary a history as this.

§ 6. Their principles required, that while they admitted *Christ* to be the *Son* of the supreme God, and a messenger sent from the *Pleròma* or upper world where God and his family dwell, for the benefit of miserable souls, they should yet hold most unworthy sentiments concerning his per-

(5) [The reader will recollect that *Dr. Mosheim's* opinions concerning a matured Oriental philosophy existing so early as the Apostolic age, have been much questioned. (See note (7), p. 61.) Moreover, the texts he quotes, speak only of certain false teachers

who laboured to pervert the truth, and not of any associations of professed Christians which they had already organized into churches upon their principles, and which constituted regular *heretical bodies*.—*Tr.*]

son and offices. They could not admit him to be truly God, nor truly man. Not truly God, because they held him, though begotten of God, to be yet much *inferior* to the Father: nor truly man, because everything concrete and corporeal, they believed to be intrinsically and essentially *evil*. So that most of them divested *Christ* of a material body, and denied him to have suffered for our sakes, what he is recorded to have endured. The cause of *Christ's* coming among men, they said, was simply to strip the tyrants of this world, those impotent genii, of their power over the virtuous and heaven-born souls of men; and to teach men, how to withdraw their divine minds from these impure bodies, and fit them for a union with God.

§ 7. Their systems of morals, we are informed, were widely different. For most of them recommended abstinence and austerity, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications; in order that the soul, whose ill fate it was to be associated with a body, might enjoy greater liberty, and be able the better to contemplate heavenly things. For, the more this depraved and grovelling habitation of the soul is weakened and attenuated, the less will it be able to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of divine objects. But some of them maintained, on the contrary, that we may safely indulge all our libidinous desires; and that there is no moral difference in human actions. (6) This contrariety of opinions need not surprise us: because one and the same principle naturally produced both systems. For persons who believed that their bodies were the very essence of evil, and calculated only to hold their souls in bondage, might, according as they were of a voluptuous or of a morose and austere disposition, either fall into the conclusion, that the acts of the body have no connexion with the soul when it has once attained to communion with God; or, on the contrary, believe that the body must be strenuously resisted and opposed, as being the enemy of the soul.

§ 8. As these extraordinary opinions required proof, which it was not easy to find in the writings of the apostles, recourse was had to falsehoods and impositions. Therefore when asked, where they had learned what they so confidently taught; some produced fictitious books, under the names of *Abraham*, *Zoroaster*, and *Christ*, or his apostles; some pretended to have derived their principles from a concealed and secret doctrine taught by *Christ*; some affirmed that they had arrived at this high degree of wisdom, by an innate energy which existed in their own minds; and some pretended that one *Theudas*, a disciple of *St. Paul*, or *Matthias*, one of *Christ's* disciples, had been their teacher. Those of them, who did not wholly reject the books of the New Testament, either interpreted them very absurdly, neglecting the true import of words, or corrupted them most basely, by retrenching what they disliked and adding what they pleased.

§ 9. It is easy to see, how these persons, after assuming the name of Christians, became divided into numerous sects. In the first place, it appears from what has been already stated, that they held very different opinions before they attended to Christianity. Hence, as each one endeavoured to accommodate his own philosophical opinions to the Christian religion, it was the necessary consequence, that various systems of religion were produced. Moreover, some of them were born Jews, as *Cerin-*

(6) See *Clemens Alex.*, *Stromat.*, lib. iii., cap. v., p. 529, ed. Potter.

thus and others, and did not wish to appear contemners of *Moses*; while others were wholly estranged from the Jewish religion, and could indulge themselves in liberties, which the former could not. And lastly, this whole system of philosophy and religion was destitute of any fixed and solid basis, being the creature of their own fancy; and who does not know, that systems and projects which are the productions of the imagination, never have uniformity.

§ 10. The heads and leaders of the philosophical sects which troubled the church in the first century, next come to be considered. The first place among them is, by many, given to *Dositheus*, a Samaritan. And it is sufficiently proved, that there was a man of this name among the Samaritans, about the times of our Saviour; and that he left a sect behind him. But all the accounts we have of him, clearly show that he is to be ranked, not among those called *heretics*, but among the enemies of the Christian name; or, if it be thought more correct, among the delirious and insane. For he wished to be thought to be himself the *Messiah*, or that Prophet whom God had promised to the Jews; and he therefore could not have held *Jesus Christ* to be a divine ambassador, or have merely corrupted *his* doctrines.(7)

§ 11. What I have said of *Dositheus*, I would likewise say of *Simon Magus*. This impious man is not to be ranked among those who corrupted Christianity by an intermixture of errors, or among the *heretics*; but is to be classed among those who declared open war against Christianity; and this notwithstanding nearly all the ancient and modern writers make him to have been the *head*, the *father*, and the *ringleader* of the whole heretical camp. For it is manifest from all the records we have of him, that after his defection from the Christians, he ascribed to *Christ* no honour at all; but set *himself* in opposition to *Christ*, and claimed to be himself the supreme power of God.(8)

§ 12. What the ancients relate of the life and opinions of *Simon*, are so different and inconsistent, that some very learned men have concluded they could not all relate to *one* person; and thus they would make out *two Simons*; the one *Simon Magus*, who abandoned the Christian religion; and the other a Gnostic *philosopher*. On this point men will judge as they

(7) *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire des Juifs, l. ii., cap. xiii., p. 307. *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccles., par M. du Pin, tom. iii., cap. xiii., p. 304. [*Mosheim*, Inst. hist. Chr. major., p. 376. C. W. F. Waleh, Ketzehistorie, i., p. 182. All the accounts make *Dositheus* to have lived among the Samaritans; one writer represents him, as an apostate Jew. According to *Origen*, (Philocal. i.), he was a rigorous observer of the law of *Moses*; and particularly, allowed no one to move from the spot where the Sabbath overtook him. According to *Epiphanius*, (Hæres., lib. i., pt. i., hæc. 13, previous to the Christian heresies), he was an apostate Jew, whose ambition being disappointed, he retired among the Samaritans, lived in a cave, and fasted so rigorously as to occasion his death. Other an-

cient accounts simply mention him among the founders of sects; as *Hegesippus*, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iv., c. 22.—It is said, his followers accounted him the *Messiah*; (*Photius*, Biblioth. cxxx.), and that *he*, at first, claimed to be so; but afterwards retracted, in presence of his pupil *Simon Magus*; (*Clemens*, Recogn., l. ii., 8, &c.)—*Eulogius*, bp. of Alexandria in the seventh century, wrote against the *Dositheans*, (according to *Photius*, Biblioth. cxxx.), and besides his pretended messiahship, he attributes to *Dositheus* various errors; all of which coincided with either Sadducean or Samaritan opinions. See *J. E. C. Schmidt*, Handb. d. christl. Kirchengeschichte, vol. i., § 50, p. 214, &c.—*Tr.*]

(8) See *Origen*, adv. Celsum, lib. v., p. 272, ed. Spencer.

please ; but to *us* it appears neither safe nor necessary to reject the testimony of the ancients that there was only *one* Simon.(9) He was by birth either a Samaritan or a Jew ; and after studying philosophy at Alexandria,(10) he professed to be a magician, as was common in that age ; and by his fictitious miracles, persuaded the Samaritans among others that he had received from God the power of controlling those evil spirits which afflict mankind ; Acts viii., 9, 10. On seeing the miracles which *Philip* performed by divine power, Simon joined himself to Philip, professed to be a Christian, and hoped to learn from the Christians the art of working miracles. When cut off from this hope by the pointed reproof of *Peter*, Acts viii., 9, 10, he not only returned to his old course of sorcery, but wherever he went, he laboured to obstruct the progress of Christianity. The accounts of his tragical death, and of a statue decreed him at Rome, are rejected with great unanimity by the learned at the present day. They are at least uncertain and improbable.(11)

§ 13. Simon undoubtedly belonged to that class of philosophers who admitted as co-existent with the supreme and all-perfect God, not only eternal *matter*, but an *evil deity* who presides over it. And if I mistake not, he was one of those in this class who believed matter to have been eternally animated, and at a certain period to have brought forth, by its inherent energies, that depraved being who now rules over it, surrounded by numerous attendants. From this opinion of Simon, the other gross errors ascribed to him by the ancients concerning fate, *the indifference of human actions, the impurity of the human body, the power of magic, &c.*, would very naturally follow.(12) The most shocking of all his abominations was, his

(9) See the Dissertation by *G. C. Voelger*, revised and published by *Mosheim*, Diss. ad Histor. Eccles. Pertinentes, vol. ii., p. 55, &c., de *uno Simone Mago*. [The idea of *two* Simons, the one a Samaritan mentioned in Acts viii., the other a Jewish philosopher in the reign of *Domitian* and the father of all the Gnostic sects ; was first thrown out as a *conjecture*, by *Camp. Vitringa*, Observ. sacrar., l. v., c. 12, § 9, p. 159, and afterwards defended by *C. A. Heumann*, Acta erudit., Lips., for April, A.D. 1717, p. 179, and *J. de Beausobre*, Diss. sur les Adamites, pt. ii., subjoined to *L'Enfant's* Histoire de la guerre des Hussites, § 1, p. 350, &c.—But this hypothesis is now generally given up.—*Tr.*]

(10) *Clementina*, homil. ii., in Patr. Apostol., tom. ii., p. 533.

(11) See *Is. de Beausobre*, Histoire de Manichée, p. 203, 395. *Auth. van Dale*, Diss. de Statua Simonis ; annexed to his book de Oraculis, p. 579. *Sal. Deyling*, Observatt. sacrar., l. i., observ. xxxvi., p. 140. *Sch. Tillmont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i., p. 340, and numerous others.—[What *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes, l. ii., p. 64, ed. Herald, and after him many others relate, with some variety, concerning Simon's death ; viz., that while practising magic at Rome, in order to in-

gratiate himself with *Nero*, he attempted to fly, being assisted by evil spirits ; but that by the prayers of *St. Peter*, the evil spirits were compelled to let him fall, which either killed him outright, or broke his bones and so mortified him, that he killed himself ; is too improbable, and has too much the aspect of fiction, to gain credit in this enlightened age.—And the mistake of *Justin Martyr*, Apol. i., c. 34, who says he saw a public statue, inscribed to *Simon*, on an island in the Tiber at Rome ; has been satisfactorily accounted for, since the discovery in the year 1574, of a stone in the Tiber at Rome, bearing this inscription : *Semoni Sanco, Deo Fidio*. For this inscription, which *Justin*, being an Asiatic, might easily misunderstand, was undoubtedly intended for an ancient pagan god.—*Tr.*]

(12) The dissertation of *Jo. Hen. Horbuis*, de Simone Mago, though a juvenile production and needing correction in style, I prefer to all others on this subject. It will be found republished by *Jo. Voigtius*, in the Biblioth. Haeresiologica, tom. i., pt. iii., p. 511. Horbuis treads closely in the steps of his preceptor, *Ja. Thomasius* ; who very clearly saw the source of those numerous errors by which the Gnostics, and especially Simon, were infected. The other writers who have treated of Simon, are enumerated by

pretence that the greatest and most powerful of the divine *Aeons* of the male sex, resided in himself; and likewise, that another *Aeon* of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, resided in his mistress *Helena*; and his proclaiming that the supreme God had despatched *him* down to this world, to break up the empire of the world's creator, and to deliver *Helena* out of that tyrant's hands.(13)

§ 14. From Simon Magus it is said, *Menander*, who was also a Samaritan, learned *his* doctrine; which is no more true than what the ancients relate, that all the heretical sects derived their origin from this Simon. *Menander* is to be stricken from the list of proper *heretics*, and to be classed among the lunatics and madmen, who foolishly arrogated to themselves the character of saviours of mankind. For it appears from the testimony of *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Tertullian*,(14) that he wished to be thought one of the *Aeons* sent from the upper world, or the *Pleroma*, to succour the souls that were here suffering miserably in material bodies; and to afford them aid against the machinations and the violence of the demons who govern our world. As he erected his religious system on nearly the same fundamental principles as Simon did his, the ancients supposed that he must have been a disciple of Simon.

§ 15. If those now mentioned are excluded from the number of the *heretics* of the first century, the first place among the Christian sects, and also among those denominated Gnostics, seems to belong to the *Nicolaitans*; of whom *Jesus Christ* himself expressed his detestation, Apoc. ii., 6, 14, 15. It is true the Saviour does not tax them with errors in matters of *faith*, but only with licentious *conduct*, and a disregard of the injunction of the apostles to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from fornication, Acts xv., 29. But the writers of the second and the following centuries, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alex.*,(15) and others, declare that they taught the same doctrines with the Gnostics, concerning *two principles* of all things, and concerning the *Aeons*, and the origin of the present world. Whether this testimony is to be admitted, or whether we are to suppose that the ancients confounded *two* different sects which bore the same name; the one the *Apocalyptic* Nicolaitans, and the other a Gnostic sect of the second century, founded by a man named *Nicolaus*; is a question which admits of doubt.(16)

Voigtius, ubi supra, p. 567. [See *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzer*, vol. i., p. 152, &c. The English reader will find a full, but not very accurate account of Simon in *Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible*.—*Tr.*]

(13) Some very learned men, I am aware, have supposed that the ancient accounts of Simon's *Helena* should be interpreted allegorically; and that Simon intended, by the name of *Helena*, to indicate *matter*, or the *soul*, or something, I know not what. But for such an allegorical interpretation, it would be easy to show, there is little foundation.

(14) [*Irenæus*, lib. i., c. 23. *Justin Martyr*, *Apol.* ii., p. 69. *Tertullian*, *de Anima*, cap. 50, and *de Resurrect.*, c. 5.—*Tr.*]

(15) [*Irenæus*, lib. iii., c. 2, and i. ii., c. 27. *Tertull.*, *de Præscript.*, c. 46. *Clem. Alex.*, *Strom.*, l. iii., c. 4.—*Tr.*]

(16) [See *Demonstratio Sectæ Nicolaitarum*, adv. doctiss. ejus oppugnatorum, cum Supplemento, in *Mosheim's* *Diss.* ad *Hister. Eccles. pertinent.*, vol. i., p. 389–495. Also *Mosheim's Institut. Hist. Christ. major.*, p. 46; and *Comment. de Reb. Christ. ante Constant. M.*, p. 195; and especially *C. W. F. Walch*, *Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzerereyen*, vol. i., p. 167. All the ancients, except *John Cassianus*, (*Collatio* xviii., c. 16), supposed that *Nicolaus* of Antioch, the deacon, (*Acts* vi., 5), was either the founder or the accidental cause of this sect. *Irenæus* makes him to have been the *founder* of it. But *Clemens Alex.* states that an incautious speech or act of his gave *occasion* only to this sect. For he being one day accused of too much attention to his wife, when he came to defend himself he publicly divorced

§ 16. With greater propriety we may reckon among the Gnostics, *Cerinthus*, a Jew by birth, (17) but educated and taught philosophy at Alexandria. (18) Though some of the learned have chosen to assign him rather to the *second* century than to the first, (19) yet it appears that it was while *St. John* was still living, that he endeavoured to form a new sect and to inculcate a singular system of religion, compounded of the doctrines and principles of *Jesus Christ*, and those of the Gnostics and Jews. From the Gnostics he borrowed the notions of a *Plerōma*, *Aeons*, a *Demiurge*, &c., but these he so modified that they appeared not wholly inconsistent with the opinions of the Jews. Therefore, to the creator of this world, whom also he acknowledged to be the sovereign and the lawgiver of the Jewish nation, he ascribed a nature possessed of the highest virtues and derived from the true God; but which, he affirmed, had gradually receded from its primitive excellence and deteriorated. Hence *God* had determined to subvert his power, by means of one of the blessed *Aeons* whose name was *Christ*. This *Christ* had entered into a certain Jew named *Jesus*, (a very righteous and holy man, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary* by ordinary generation), by descending upon him in the form of a dove, at the time when he was baptized by John in the river Jordan. After his union with *Christ*, this *Jesus* vigorously assailed the God of the Jews, the world's creator; and by his instigation *Jesus* was seized by the rulers of the Jewish nation

her, using the expression, *ὅτι παραχρησάσθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δέι*, it is proper to abuse the flesh; i. e., to subdue its corrupt propensities. This speech was afterward perversely applied by a Gnostic association to justify their abominations. To this account, agree *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iii., c. 29. *Theodoret*, Hæret. Fab., l. iii., c. 1, tom. iv., Opp., p. 226; and *Augustine*, de Hæres., cap. 5. Now the question arises, whether there actually was in the time of *St. John*, a heretical party holding different fundamental principles from the orthodox, and distinguished by the name of *Nicolaitans*. Some say there was; others say there was not. Dr. *Mosheim* takes the affirmative, on account of the historical credibility of the fathers, and the literal import of the words used in the Apocalypse. The next question is, Who was the founder of this sect? Here, some follow *Irenæus*; others follow *Clement Alex.*; and some, among whom is Dr. *Mosheim*, think it probable there were two persons of the name of Nicolaus. If this supposition be admitted, it will be easy to account for the fact, that the Nicolaitans of the fathers are accused of Gnosticism, while there is no mention of it in the Apocalypse. —*Baumgarten's* Auszug der Kirchengeschichte, th. i., p. 458.—*Schl.*

(17) [For *Epiphanius* states, Hæres. xxviii., § 3, that he was circumcised; and *Johannes Damascenus*, de Hæres., cap. 8, that his followers were Jews. His doctrines, also, show a higher respect for the Jewish

forms of worship, than is common for the Gnostic heretics. *Walch's* Entw. der Historie der Ketz., vol. i., p. 250.—*Schl.*]

(18) *Theodoret*, Fabul. Hæret., lib. ii., cap. 3, Opp., tom. iii., p. 219.

(19) See *Sam. Basnage*, Annal. polit. eccles., tom. ii., p. 6. *Peter Faydit*, Eclaircissements sur l'histoire eccles. de deux premiers siècles, cap. v., p. 64; and others.—With these, *Jo. Fr. Buddens* contends, de Ecclesia Apostol., cap. v., p. 412; [and *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tome ii., p. 486; and *Mosheim*, Institut. Hist. eccles. major., sec. i., p. 439, &c. They who place Cerinthus in the *second* century, rely chiefly on two arguments. The first is, that the ancient writers who treat of the heretics, set down Cerinthus after *Marcion*, [rather after *Carpocrates*.—*Tr.*] The other rests on a spurious letter of *Pius*, bishop of Rome, [in the middle of the *second* century.—*Tr.*], to *Justus*, bishop of Vienne; in which *Pius* laments that Cerinthus was at that time making many proselytes. The epistle may be found in *Constant. Epistol. Pontific.*, Append., tom. i., p. 19. [and in *Binius*, Concil. Gen., tom. i., p. 124.—*Tr.*] But the first argument proves nothing, because the historians of the heresies pay no regard to chronological order; and the second falls, because the epistle is not genuine.—*Schl.*]—But, see on this subject, *Fr. Ad. Lampe*, Commentar. in Johana. Proleg., lib. ii., c. 3, § 13, &c., p. 191, &c.—*Tr.*]

and nailed to the cross. But when *Jesus* was apprehended, *Christ* flew away to heaven; so that only the man *Jesus* was put to death. *Cerinthus* required his followers to worship the supreme God, the father of *Christ*, together with *Christ* himself; but to abandon the Jewish Lawgiver, whom he accounted the creator of this world; and while they retained some parts of the Mosaic law, to regulate their lives chiefly by the precepts of *Christ*. He promised them a resurrection of their bodies; which would be succeeded by exquisite delights in the millenary reign of *Christ*; and then would follow a happy and never-ending life in the celestial world. For *Cerinthus* supposed that *Christ* would hereafter return, and would unite himself again with the man *Jesus*, in whom he had before dwelt, and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine. (20)

§ 17. Those who maintained the necessity of the Mosaic law and ceremonies in order to eternal salvation, had not proceeded so far in this century, as to have no communion with those who thought differently. They were of course accounted brethren, though weaker ones. But after the second destruction of Jerusalem in the reign of *Adrian*, when they withdrew from the other Christians and set up separate congregations, they were regarded as *sectarians*, who had deviated from the true doctrines of *Christ*. Hence arose the names, *Nazareans* (21) and *Ebionites*; (22) by which those Christians, whose errors originated from an attachment to the Mosaic law, were discriminated from the other Christians, who held that the Mosaic ceremonial law was abrogated by *Christ*. These *Nazareans* or *Ebionites*, though commonly set down among the sects of the apostolic age, in reality belong to the *second* century, in which they first became a distinct sect.

(20) [The doctrines of *Cerinthus* are stated in full, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 260, &c., and by *Mosheim*, Institut. Hist. Christ. major., p. 445, and Comment. de Reb. Christianor. ante Constant. M., p. 196.—It may be remarked, that *Irenæus*, adv. Hæres., l. iii., c. 3, says he had heard from various persons, that *Polycarp* told them that the apostle *John* once met *Cerinthus* in a public bath at Ephesus, and instantly fled out, saying he was afraid the bath would fall on that enemy of the truth and kill him. This story may be true; notwithstanding *Irenæus* had it from third hand testimony. But the addition to it, that *Cerinthus* was actually killed by the fall of the building, as soon as *John* was gone out, was first annexed in modern times by the Dominican *Bernhard* of Luxemburg, in his Catalogus Hæreticorum; and it deserves no credit. See *Walch*, ubi supra, p. 255.—*Schl.*]

(21) [This name the Jews first gave by way of reproach, to the disciples of *Christ*; because he was a citizen of *Nazareth*. Acts xxiv., 5. Afterwards the name was applied especially to a Christian sect, which endeavoured to unite the Mosaic law with the reli-

gion of *Christ*. Of these *Nazareans*, *Mosheim* treats largely, Institut. Hist. Christ. major., p. 465, and Comment. de Rebus Christ. ante Const. M., p. 328; as also *C. W. F. Walch*, Entw. d. Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 101, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) [The origin of this name is still a subject of controversy. Some derive it from a founder of this sect, who was called *Ebion*. Others think the name *Ebionites*, to be equivalent to the Hebrew word אֶבְיֹנִים *poor people*: but they are not agreed why this name was given to the sect. Others again, regard the whole subject as a historical problem, that can never be solved with absolute certainty. It is treated of largely, by *C. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf der Gesch. d. Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 110; and by *Mosheim*, Institut. Historiæ Christ. major., p. 477, and in his Diss. qua ostenditur, certo hodie et explorare constitui non posse, utrum *Ebion* quidam novæ Sectæ auctor extiterit olim inter Christianos, nec ne? in his Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent., vol. i., p. 547, &c. See also *Chr. Alb. Doederlein*, Commentar. de Ebionæis e numero hostium Christi eximendis, Büzow, 1770, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

CENTURY SECOND.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Character of the Roman Emperors.—§ 2. Propagation of Christianity in the Roman Empire.—§ 3. Countries enlightened by Christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the Germans.—§ 5. The Gauls converted.—§ 6. Translation of the N. T.—§ 7. Apologies and other Writings of Christians.—§ 8. Miracles and Extraordinary Gifts.—§ 9. Miracle of the Thundering Legion.—§ 10. It is uncertain.—§ 11. Sedition and Slaughter of the Jews.—§ 12. Philosophers become Christians.

§ 1. Most of the Roman emperors of this century were of a mild and equitable character. *Trajan*, [A.D. 98–117], though too eager for glory, and not always sufficiently considerate and provident, was humane and equitable. *Adrian* [A.D. 117–138] was more severe, yet not absolutely bad and tyrannical; his character was a compound of virtues and vices. The *Antonines* [*Pius* A.D. 138–161, *Marcus Aurelius the Philos.* A.D. 161–180, with *Verus* A.D. 161–169, and *Commodus* A.D. 169–192] were models of excellence and benignity. Even *Severus*, [A.D. 193–211], who afterwards assumed another character, was at first oppressive to no one, and to the Christians mild and equitable.

§ 2. Through this lenity of the emperors, Christians living in the Roman empire suffered far less, than they would have done if they had been under severer lords. The laws enacted against them were indeed sufficiently hard; and the magistrates, excited by the priests and the populace, often made considerable havoc among them, and frequently went much beyond what the laws required. Yet for these evils some relief was commonly attainable. *Trajan* would not have the Christians to be sought after; and he forbid any complaints being received against them, without the names of the accusers annexed.(1.) And *Antoninus Pius* even decreed, that their accusers should be punished.(2.) Some in one way, and others in another,

(1) See *Pliny's* Epistles, lib. x., ep. 98.

(2) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., cap. 13, [where the law of *Antoninus* is given at length, from the Apology of *Melito*. Some indeed, have supposed that it was *Marcus Antoninus*, and not *Antoninus Pius*, who issued this decree. (So *Valesius* in loc.) But this is contrary to the express testimony of *Eusebius*, and to the contents of the edict

itself. For we know from history, that the earthquakes mentioned in the edict, happened under *Pius*. See *Capitolinus*, Life of *Antoninus Pius*, cap. 9. Besides, if *Marcus* himself had published this edict, *Melito* could have had no occasion, by this Apology, to implore the grace of this emperor in favour of the Christians. See *Moshcim*, de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M., p. 240.—*Schl.*]

protected them against the evil designs of the populace and the priests. Hence the Christian community increased, and became vastly numerous in this century. Of this fact we have the clearest testimony of the ancients, which some have in vain attempted to call in question.(3)

§ 3. On what particular countries, both within the Roman empire and beyond it, the light of heavenly truth first shone in this century, the defects in the ancient records will not allow us to state with precision. There are unexceptionable witnesses who declare, that in nearly all the East, and among the Germans, the Spaniards, the Celts, the Britons, and other nations, *Christ* was now worshipped as God.(4) But if any inquire, which of these nations received Christianity in *this* century, and which in the preceding, it is not in my power to answer.—*Pantaenus*, master of the school at Alexandria, is said to have instructed the Indians in Christianity.(5) But these Indians appear to have been certain Jews, living in

(3) See *Walt. Moyle*, de *Legione fulminatrice*; a Latin translation of which, with notes, I have annexed to my *Syntagma Diss. ad sanctorum disciplinas pertinent.*, p. 652–661. See also an additional passage in *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 341.

(4) *Irenæus*, adv. Hæres., l. i., c. 10. *Tertullian*, adv. Judæos, cap. 7. [The testimony of the former is this: “Neither do those churches, which are established among the *Germans*, believe or teach otherwise; nor do those among the *Hiberii*, or among the *Celts*; nor those in the *East*; nor those in *Egypt*; nor those in *Libya*; nor those established in the *central parts of the world*.”—The language of *Tertullian* is rhetorical; and the statement, undoubtedly, somewhat too strong. He says: “In whom, but the *Christ* now come, have all nations believed? For, in whom do all other nations (but yours, the *Jews*) confide; Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and inhabitants of Pontus and Asia, and Pamphylia; the dwellers in Egypt, and inhabitants of the region beyond Cyrene? Romans and strangers; and in Jerusalem both Jews and proselytes; so that the various tribes of the *Getuli*, and the numerous hordes of the *Mauri*; all the Spanish clans, and the different nations of Gauls, and the regions of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans but subject to *Christ*, and of the Sarmatians and Dacians, and Germans, and Scythians, and many unexplored nations, and countries, and islands unknown to us, and which we cannot enumerate:—in all which places, the name of the *Christ* who has already come, now reigns.”—*Tr.*]

(5) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., c. 10. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr., c. 36. [According to *Eusebius*, the zeal of *Pantaenus* prompted him to undertake a voluntary mission among the Indians. But according to

Jerome, (de Scriptor. illustr., c. 36, and Epist. 83, Opp., tom. iv., pt. ii., p. 656, ed. Bened.), he was sent out by *Demetrius*, bp. of Alexandria, in consequence of a request made by the Indians for a Christian teacher. Perhaps *Pantaenus* first spontaneously travelled among the nearer Arabians; and, upon the request of the people here called Indians for a teacher, *Demetrius* directed him to visit that people.—As it is well known, that the Greek and Latin writers give the name of *Indians* to the Persians, Parthians, Medes, Arabians, Ethiopians, Libyans, and many other nations, to them little known; the learned have inquired, who were the Indians visited by *Pantaenus*? Many think, they were those we call the East Indians, inhabiting the country about the river Indus. *Jerome* so thought; for he represents him as sent to instruct the *Brachmans*. *Hen. Valesius* and *Lu. Holstenius* and others suppose, they were the Abyssinians or Ethiopians; who are often called Indians, who were near and always had intercourse with the Egyptians. See *S. Basnage*, Annal. pol. eccles., tom. ii., p. 207. *Valesius*, Adnotat. ad *Socratis* Hist. Eccles., p. 13. Others incline to believe them *Jews*, resident in *Yemen* or Arabia Felix, a country often called India. That they were not strangers to Christianity, is evident from their having *Matthew's Gospel* among them, and from their desiring some one to expound it to them. Their applying to the bp. of Alexandria, shows that *Egypt* was to them the most accessible Christian country; and their having the Gospel written in *Hebrew*, as *Jerome* testifies, is good proof that they were *Jews*; because no other people understood that language. Besides, *Bartholomew* had formerly been among them; the field of whose labours has been supposed to be Arabia Felix. See *Tillemont's* life of *Bartholomew*, in his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*,

Arabia Felix ; among whom the apostle *Bartholomew* had previously introduced the Christian religion. For *Pantaenus* found among them, according to the testimony of *Jerome*, the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, which they had received from their first teacher *Bartholomew*.

§ 4. From *Gaul*, it would seem, the Christian religion must have spread into *Germany* on the left of the *Rhine*, which was subject to the *Romans*, and also into *Britain* over against *Gaul*.(6) Yet certain churches in *Germany* have been accustomed to deduce their origin from the companions and disciples of *St. Peter* and other apostles ;(7) and the *Britons*, following the account given by *Beda*, would fain believe, that their king *Lucius* sought and obtained Christian teachers from *Eleutherus* the Roman pontiff, in this second century, and during the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*.(8) But

tom. i., p. 1160, 1161.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ. ante C. M., p. 206, 207.—Tr.]

(6) On the origin of the *German* churches, mentioned by *Tertullian* and *Irenæus* as existing in this century, *Jo. Hen. Ursinus*, *Bebelius*, and others have written ; and still better, *Gabriel Liron*, *Singularitéz historiques et litteraires*, tom. iv., Paris, 1740, 8vo. —The common and popular accounts of the first preachers of the Gospel in *Germany*, are learnedly impugned by *Aug. Calmet*, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. Diss. sur les Eveques de Treves, p. 3, 4. *Bolland*, *Acta sanctorum*, January, tom. ii., p. 922. *Jo. Nic. de Hontheim*, Diss. de æra episcopat. Trevirensis ; in *Historiæ Trevirensis* tom. i.

(7) [It is said, *St. Peter* sent *Euchernus*, *Valerius*, and *Maternus* into *Belgie Gaul* ; and that they planted the churches of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Tongres*, *Liege*, and some others, and presided over them till their death. See *Christo. Brouer*, *Annales Trevirenses*, l. ii., p. 143, &c., and *Acta Sanctorum Antwerpensia*, 29th of January, p. 918. —But *Calmet*, *Bolland*, and *Hontheim*, (ubi supra), have proved satisfactorily, that these pretended founders of the *German* churches, did not live earlier than the third or fourth century ; and that they were first represented as being legates of the apostles, in the middle ages.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 212.—Tr.]

(8) See *Ja. Usher*, *Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Britannicæ*, cap. i., p. 7. *Francis Godwin*, de *Conversione Britannicæ*, cap. i., p. 7. *Rapin de Thoyras*, *History of England*, vol. i. [Wil. Burton, *Annotat. ad Clementis Rom. Epist. ad Corinth.*, in *Patribus Apostol.*, tom. ii., p. 470. *Edw. Stillingfleet*, de *Antiquitate Ecclesiæ Britannicæ*, cap. i. *Fred. Spanheim*, *Historia Ecclesiæ major, sæculi ii.*, p. 603, 604 —The first publication of the Gospel in *Britain*, has been attributed to *James the son of Zebedee*, whom *Herod* put to death, (*Acts* xii. 1), to *Simon Zelotes*, another apostle, to *Aristobulus*, (mentioned *Rom.* xvi. 10), to *St.*

Peter, &c., by some few legendary writers, who are cited by *Usher*, *Ecclesiæ Britannicæ*, *Primordia*, cap. i.—But rejecting these accounts, *William of Malmesbury*, and after him, many other monks maintained that *Joseph of Arimathea* with twelve others, were sent from *Gaul*, by *St. Philip*, into *Britain* A.D. 63 ; that they were successful in planting Christianity ; spent their lives in *England* ; had twelve hides of land assigned them by the king at *Glastonbury*, where they first built a church of hurdles, and afterward established a monastery. By maintaining the truth of this story, the *English* clergy obtained the precedence of some others, in several councils of the 15th century, and particularly that of *Basil* A.D. 1434, (*Usher's* *Primordia*, ch. ii., p. 12-30). Since the reformation, this story has been given up by most of the *English* clergy. But, as *Eusebius*, (*Demonstrat. Evang.* l. iii., c. 5), and *Theodoret*, (*Graecar. Curatio Affectuum*, l. ix.), name the *Britons* among others, to whom the *Apostles* themselves preached the Gospel, some have maintained, that *St. Paul* must have visited that country ; and they urge that *Clemens Rom.* says, that this apostle travelled ἐπὶ τὸ τέμα της δύσεως to the utmost bounds of the west. They also urge, that among the many thousand *Romans* who passed over into *Britain* in the reign of *Claudius* and his successors, there were doubtless some *Christians*, who would spread the knowledge of *Christ* there. But the principal reliance has been on the reported application of king *Lucius* to pope *Eleutherus* for Christian teachers, about A.D. 150, or rather 176. (*Usher*, *Primordia*, ch. iv., p. 44, &c.).—On all these traditions *Dr. Mosheim* passes the following judgment. Whether any apostle, or any companion of an apostle, ever visited *Britain*, cannot be determined ; yet the balance of probability rather inclines towards the affirmative. The story of *Joseph of Arimathea*, might arise from the arrival of some *Christian* teacher from *Gaul*, in the second century, whose

these ancient accounts are exposed to much doubt, and are rejected by the best informed persons.

§ 5. Transalpine Gaul, which is now called *France*, perhaps received some knowledge of the Gospel before this century, either from the apostles or from their friends and disciples. But unequivocal proofs of the existence of churches in this part of Europe, first occur in the present century. For in it *Pothinus*, a man of distinguished piety and devotedness to *Christ*, in company with *Irenæus* and other holy men, proceeded from Asia to Gaul, and there instructed the people with such success, that he gathered churches of Christians at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, of which *Pothinus* himself was the first bishop.(9)

name was *Joseph*. As the Gauls, from *Dionysius*, bp. of Paris in the *second* century, made *Dionysius* the Areopagite to be their apostle; and as the Germans made *Maternus*, *Eucherius*, and *Valerius*, who lived in the *third* and *fourth* centuries, to be preachers of the *first* century, and attendants on *St. Peter*; so the British monks, I have no doubt, made a certain *Joseph*, from Gaul, in the *second* century, to be *Joseph* of Arimathea.—As to *Lucius*, I agree with the best British writers, in supposing him to be the restorer and second father of the English churches, and not their original founder. That he was a king, is not probable; because Britain was then a Roman province. He might be a nobleman, and governor of a district. His name is Roman. His application, I can never believe was made to the bp. of Rome. It is much more probable, that he sent to Gaul for Christian teachers. The independence of the ancient British churches on the see of Rome, and their observing the same rights with the Gallic churches, which were planted by Asiatics, and particularly in regard to the time of Easter; show that they received the Gospel from Gaul, and not from Rome.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 213, &c.—*Tr.*]

(9) *Peter de Marca*, Epistola de Evangelii in Gallia initis; published among his Dissertations, and also by Valesius, subjoined to Eusebii Historia Eccles. *Jo. Launoï*, Opuscula, in his Opp., tom. ii.—Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. i., p. 223. *Gabr. Liron*, Singularitez historiques et litteraires; the whole *fourth* volume, Paris, 1740, 8vo, and others.—[The most eminent French writers have disputed about the origin of their churches. Three different opinions have been advanced. The first is that of *Jo. Launoï*, (ubi supra), whom many writers of eminence at this day follow. It is, that, if we except the Asiatic colonists of Lyons and Vienne, among whom there were Christian churches formed about A.D. 150; the first propagation of Christianity among the Transalpine Gauls was by missionaries

from Rome, about A.D. 250. This hypothesis is founded chiefly on the testimony of three ancient writers; viz., *Sulpicius Severus*, Historia Sacra, lib. ii., c. 32, where, speaking of the persecution at Lyons and Vienne, under *Marcus Antoninus*, (A.D. 177), he says; *Ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa; serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta: these were the first martyrs among the Gauls; for the divine religion was not received till late beyond the Alps*. The next testimony is that of the author of the *Acts of Saturninus*, bishop of Toulouse, who suffered under *Decius*. The author is supposed to have written in the beginning of the *fourth* century. He says: *Raras tertio sæculo in aliquibus Galliarum civitatibus ecclesias paucorum Christianorum devotione consurrexisse: scattering churches of a few Christians arose in some cities of Gaul in the third century*. See *T. Ruinart*, Acta Martyr. sincera, p. 130. The third testimony is that of *Gregory* of Tours, the father of French history, (in the Historia Francor., lib. i., cap. 27, and de Gloria Confessorum, cap. 30, ed. Ruinart, p. 399.) He says: *sub Decio septem viros ad prædicandum Româ in Galliam missos esse: under Decius, (A.D. 248–251), seven missionaries were sent from Rome to preach in Gaul*. Now these seven missionaries are the very persons, who are said to have been sent thither by *St. Paul* and *St. Peter*; viz., *Trophimus* bishop of Arles, *Stremonius* bishop of Clermont, *Martial* bishop of Limoges, *Paul* bishop of Narbonne, *Saturninus* bishop of Toulouse, *Gratian* bishop of Tours, and *Dionysius* bishop of Paris.—The *second* opinion is, that of the strenuous advocates for the apostolic origin of the Gallic churches, *Peter de Marca*, (ubi supra), *Natalis Alexander*, (Histor. Eccles., sæcul. i., diss. 16, 17, vol. iii., p. 356–420, ed. Paris, 1741, 4to), and others. They consider *St. Paul* and *St. Peter* as the fathers of their church. *Paul*, they think, travelled over nearly all France, in his supposed journey to Spain; and also sent *St. Luke* and *Creseens* into

§ 6. This rapid propagation of Christianity, is ascribed by the writers of the second century almost exclusively to the efficient will of God, to the energy of divine truth, and to the miracles wrought by Christians. Yet human counsels and pious efforts ought not to be wholly overlooked. Much was undoubtedly effected by the activity of pious men, who recommended and communicated to the people around them the writings of Christ's ambassadors; which were already collected into one volume. All people, indeed, were not acquainted with the language in which these divine books were composed; but this obstacle was early removed by the labours of translators. As the language of the Romans was extensively used, many Latin translations were made at an early period, as we are informed by *Augustine*. (10)

that country. For the last they allege, 2 Tim. iv., 10, "*Crescens to Galatia*," or rather to *Gaul*, according to *Epiphanius* and others, who, for *Γαλατιαν*, would read *Γαλλίαν*. *St. Peter*, they suppose, sent *Trophimus* his disciple into Gaul. *St. Philip*, also, they suppose, laboured in Gaul. And the seven bishops above mentioned, they say, were sent by the apostles from Rome.—Very few at this day embrace this opinion entire. It rests principally on very suspicious testimony, or on conjectures and vulgar traditions.—The third opinion takes a middle course between the first and the second, and is that which is maintained by *Gabr. Liron*, Diss. sur l'établissement de la religion Chrétienne dans les Gaules, in the fourth volume of his *Singularitéz historique*, &c., Paris, 1740, 8vo. It admits what *Launoi*, *Sirmond*, and *Tillemont* have fully proved, that *Dionysius* the first bishop of Paris, was not *Dionysius* the Areopagite, mentioned Acts xvii., 34, but a man who lived in the third century. It also gives up the story of *St. Philip*, and of most of the pretended apostolic missionaries to Gaul. But it maintains the probability of *Paul's* travelling over Gaul on his way to Spain; and of his sending *Luke* and *Crescens* to that country; and affirms that in the second century, there were many flourishing churches in Gaul, besides those of Lyons and Vienne.

Dr. Mosheim, (De Rebus Christ. ante C. M., p. 208, &c.), thinks neither of these opinions is fully confirmed in all its parts. The second, he gives up wholly. The third, he conceives, lacks evidence. Particularly, *Paul's* journey to Spain, is itself questionable; and, if admitted, there is no proof that he passed through Gaul. For *St. Luke's* mission to Gaul, there is no evidence but the declaration of *Epiphanius*, (Hæres., l. i., § 11), who, to say the least, is not the best authority; and, besides, might possibly mean *Cisalpine Gaul*, lying between Dalmatia and Italy. The mission of *Crescens* to Gaul, mentioned by *Epiphanius* in the same connexion, depends entirely on the contested

reading of *Γαλλίαν* for *Γαλατιαν*, 2 Tim. iv., 10, and which, if admitted, might be understood of *Cisalpine Gaul*. If there were many flourishing churches in Gaul, before *Pothinus* went there, (which perhaps was the case), this will not prove them to have been planted by the apostles and their companions, which is the point contended for.—As to the first opinion, namely, that *Pothinus* and his companions first preached the Gospel in Gaul, it is not fully substantiated. *Sulpicius Severus* only affirms that it was late, before the Gospel was preached there; and not, that it never was preached there till the times of *Pothinus*. The testimony of the *Acts of Saturninus* only shows, that the progress of the Gospel in Gaul was so slow, that there were but few churches there in the third century; which might be true, even if the apostles had there erected one or two churches. The testimony of *Gregory Turonensis*, fully disproves the apostolic age of the seven Gallic missionaries; and shows that the Christians in Gaul were few in number, before the reign of *Decius*: but it does not show when the Gospel was first preached in that country. On the whole, *Dr. Mosheim* thinks it probable, the Gospel was preached in Gaul before the second century, and possibly by *Luke* or *Crescens*, or even by some apostle. But he thinks Christianity, for a long time, made very little progress in that country, and that probably the churches there had become almost extinct when *Pothinus* and his companions from Asia planted themselves at Lyons and Vienne, about A.D. 150. Nearly the same opinion was embraced by *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise*, tome iv., p. 983.—Tr.]

(10) *Augustine*, de Doctrina Christiana, lib. ii., cap. 11, and cap. 15. [Qui Scripturas ex Hebræa lingua in Græcam verterunt, numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique, primis fidei temporibus, in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque lingue habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari. —In ipsi autem interpretationibus, Italia

Of these, that which is called the *Italic Version*,⁽¹¹⁾ was preferred to all others. The Latin version was followed by a Syriac, an Egyptian, an Ethiopic, and some others. But the precise dates of these several translations cannot be ascertained.⁽¹²⁾

§ 7. Those who wrote *apologies* for the Christians, and thus met the calumnies and slanders by which they were unjustly assailed, removed some obstacles to the progress of *Christ's* religion, and in this way contributed not a little to the enlargement of the church. For very many were prevented from embracing Christianity, solely by those detestable calumnies with which ungodly men aspersed it.⁽¹³⁾ Another support to the Christian cause, was furnished by the writers against the *heretics*. For the doctrines of these sects were so absurd, or so abominable, and the morals of some of them so disgraceful and impious, as to induce many to stand aloof from Christianity. But when they learned from the books against the heretics, that the true followers of *Christ* held these perverse men in abhorrence, their feelings towards them were changed.

§ 8. It is easier to conceive than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and the *extraordinary divine gifts* which the Christians exercised on various occasions, contributed to extend the limits of the church. The gift of foreign tongues appears to have gradually ceased, as soon as many nations became enlightened with the truth, and numerous churches of Christians were everywhere established; for it became less necessary than it was at first. But the other gifts with which God favoured the rising church of *Christ*, were, as we learn from numerous testimonies of the ancients, still conferred on particular persons here and there.⁽¹⁴⁾

cæteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiæ.]

(11) See *J. G. Carpzov*, *Critica Sacra* V. T., p. 663, [and the Introductions to the N. Test. by *Michaelis*, *Horne*, and others. — *Tr.*]

(12) See *Ja. Basnage*, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, liv. ix., cap. 1, tome i., p. 450.

(13) ["Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the Christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they derided the heathen polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were forced at first to hold their religious assemblies in the night; with a multitude of other ignominious epithets employed against them by *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, *Celsus*, &c. See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian church*, book i., ch. ii., p. 5."—*Macl.*]

(14) Collections of these testimonies have been made, by *Tob. Pfanner*, de donis miraculosis; and by *W. Spencer*, Notes on Origen against Celsus, p. 5, 6; but the most copious is by *Mammachi*, *Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ*, tom. i., p. 363, &c.

[The principal testimonies of the second and third centuries, are *Justin Martyr*, *Apol.* ii., c. 6, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, c. 39 and 82. *Irenæus*, l. ii., c. 31, and l. v., c. 6; and in *Euseb. H. E.*, l. v., c. 7. *Tertull.*, *Apol.* og., c. 23, 27, 32, 37; ad *Scap.*, c. 2. *Origen* contra *Cels.*, l. i., p. 7, and l. vii., p. 334, ed. *Spencer*. *Dionys. Alex.*, in *Euseb. H. E.*, lib. vi., c. 40. *Minucius Felix*, *Octav.*, p. 361, ed. *Paris*, 1605. *Cyprian*, de *Idol. vanit.*, p. 14, ad *Demetrian.*, p. 191, ed. *Brem.*—That what are called the *miraculous* gifts of the Holy Spirit, were liberally conferred, not only in this but also in the following century, especially on those engaged in propagating the Gospel; all who are called Christians, believe, on the unanimous and concordant testimony of the ancient writers. Nor do we, in my opinion, hereby incur any just charge of departing from sound reason. For, as these witnesses are all grave men, fair and honest, some of them philosophers, men who lived in different countries, and relate not what they heard, but what they saw, call God to witness the truth of their declarations, (see *Origen* contra *Celsum*, l. i., p. 35, ed. *Spencer*), and do not claim for themselves, but attribute to others, these miraculous powers; what reason can there be, for refusing to believe them? Yet a few years since, there

§ 9. I wish we were fully authorized to place among the miracles, what many ancient writers have recorded concerning a certain legion of Christian soldiers in the army of *Marcus Antoninus*, in his war against the Mar-

appeared among the Britons, a man of no ordinary genius and learning, *Conyers Middleton*, who published a considerable volume, accusing the whole Christian world of credulity, in this matter; and boldly pronouncing all that was said or written by the numerous ancients, concerning these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, to be false. See *A free Inquiry into the miraculous powers*, &c., London, 1749, 4to. The history of this famous book, and of the sharp contests it produced in England, may be learned from the British, French, and German *Literary Journals*, and from the German translation and refutation of the work, which has been recently published. I shall here offer only a few observations on this, in many respects most important subject. The apostolic age, the learned *Middleton* himself acknowledges, to have been fruitful in miracles and extraordinary gifts. But he denies their continuance after the decease of the apostles; and concludes that whatever accounts exist of miracles in the *second* and *third* centuries, are the invention of crafty impostors, or the dreams of weak and deluded men. And he attributes great importance to this opinion; because the pretended miracles of the Romish saints, rest on the same supports and arguments, as these miracles of the early ages; so that the former can never be disproved, if the latter be admitted. This looks honest and worthy of a sound Christian man; for the divine origin of the Christian religion does not depend on the truth of the miracles reported to have been wrought in the *second* and *third* centuries, but is sufficiently proved, if it can be made evident that *Christ and his apostles* had power to suspend the laws of nature. But the discerning reader of the book will perceive, that the author has assailed the miracles of *Christ* and the apostles, by his attack on those of subsequent date; and that he intended to weaken our confidence in all events, which exceed the powers of nature. For, the objections he raises against the miracles of the second and third centuries, are of such a nature as to be readily applied to those of the first.—The substance of his eloquent and learned argumentation, is this. All the writers of the three first centuries, whose works are extant, were ignorant of criticism, and not sufficiently guarded and cautious, but sometimes too credulous. Therefore all that they state, concerning the miracles of their own times, and even of miracles which they saw

with their own eyes, ought to be regarded as a fable. As if it were a conceded point, that no man, unless he is a good critic, can distinguish a true miracle from a false one; and, that *he* must always mistake and err, who sometimes yields his assent sooner than he ought. If this great man had only said, that some of the supernatural events which are reported to have happened in the early ages, are very questionable, the position might be admitted: but to aim, by one such general argument, which is liable to innumerable exceptions, and destitute of a necessary and evident conclusiveness, to overthrow the united testimony of so many pious men, and men sufficiently cautious in other things; indicates, if I do not greatly mistake, a mind of high daring, and covertly plotting against religion itself. It is fortunate that this distinguished man, a little before his death, (for he died the last year [A.D. 1750,]) appears to have learned, from the arguments of his opposers, the weakness of his opinions. For in his last reply, published after his death, namely, *A Vindication of the free Inquiry*, &c., Lond., 1751, 4to, though he is here more contentious and contumelious than was proper, he plainly acknowledges himself vanquished, and surrenders the palm to his antagonists. For he says, he did not mean to affirm, that no miracles were wrought in the ancient Christian church, after the death of the apostles; on the contrary, he concedes, he says, that God did confirm the truth of Christianity, as occasion required, by repeated manifestations of his infinite power: all that he aimed to show, was, that the power of working miracles *constantly* and *perpetually* was not exercised in the church, after the apostolic age; and therefore, that credit is not to be given to the statements of those ancient defenders of Christianity, who arrogate such a perpetual power; that is, if I can understand him,—among the doctors of the second and third centuries, there was not one that could work miracles, *whenever he pleased*. But this is wholly changing the question. The learned author might have spared himself the labour of writing and defending his book, if this was all he intended when he commenced writing. For, so far as I know, it never came into the head of any Christian, to maintain that there were men among the Christians of the second, third, and fourth centuries, to whom God gave power to work miracles, as often as they pleased, and of what kind they pleased,

comanni, [A.D. 174], which by its supplications procured a shower of rain when the Roman troops were ready to perish with thirst. But the reality of this miracle is a subject of controversy among the learned; and those who think that the Christian soldiers misjudged, in regarding that sudden and unexpected shower by which the Roman army was saved, as a miraculous, divine interposition, are supported not only by very respectable authorities, but by arguments of no little weight.(15)

§ 10. It is certain, that the Roman army when reduced to the greatest straits was relieved by a sudden shower; and that this shower was regarded both by the pagans and the Christians as extraordinary and miraculous; the latter ascribed the unexpected favour to *Christ's* being moved by the prayers of his friends, while the former attributed it to Jupiter, or Mercury, or to the power of magic. It is equally certain, I think, that many Christians were then serving in the Roman army. And who can doubt that these, on such an occasion, implored the compassion of their God and Saviour? Further, as the Christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed every unusual and peculiar advantage enjoyed by the Romans to the prayers of Christians, it is not strange, that the salvation of the Roman emperor and his army, should be placed among the miracles which God wrought in answer to the prayers of Christians. But, as all wise men are now agreed that no event is to be accounted a miracle if it can be adequately accounted for on natural principles, or in the common and ordinary course of divine providence; and as this rain may be easily thus accounted for; it is obvious what judgment ought to be formed respecting it.

§ 11. The *Jews*, first under *Trajan*, [A.D. 116], and afterwards under *Adrian*, [A.D. 132], led on by *Bar Chochebas* who pretended to be the *Messiah*, made insurrection against the Romans; and again suffered the greatest calamities. A vast number of them were put to death; and a new city, called *Aelia Capitolina*, was erected on the site of Jerusalem, which not an individual of the miserable race was allowed to enter.(16) This overthrow of the Jews confirmed in some measure, the external tranquillity of

at all times, and in all places. *Bella geri placuit, nulla habitura triumphos.*—Thus *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 221, &c. —Very candid remarks on this subject, may also be found in *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 380, &c.; and in *Jortin's* Remarks on Eccl. Hist., vol. i., passim.—*Tr.*

(15) The arguments on the two sides of the question may be seen in *Herm. Witsius*, Diss. de Legione fulminatrice, subjoined to his *Aegyptiaca*; he defends the reality of the miracle: and *Dan. Laroque*, Diss. de Legione fulminat., subjoined to the *Adversaria Sacra*, of his father *Matth. Laroque*; who opposes the idea of a miracle:—but best of all in the controversy concerning the miracle of the thundering legion, between *Peter King* [rather the *Rev. Richard King*, of Topsham—*Tr.*] and *Walter Moyle*; which I have translated into Latin, and published, with notes, in my *Syntagma Dissertationum ad disciplinas sanctiores pertinen-*

tium. See also *P. E. Jablonski*, Spicilegium de legione fulminatrice; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens.*, tom. viii., p. 417, where in particular, the reasons are investigated, which led the Christians improperly to class this rain among the miracles.—[See also *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 249, &c. —The most important among the ancient accounts of this matter are, on the side of the pagans, *Dion Cassius*, *Historia Romana*, lib. lxxi., c. 8. *Julius Capitolinus*, *Life of Marcus Antonin.*, cap. 24. *Aelius Lamprid.*, *Life of Heliogabalus*, cap. 9. *Claudian*, *Consulat.* vi., *Honorii* v.—and on the side of the Christians, *Tertullian*, *Apologet.*, cap. 5, ad *Scapulam*, cap. 4. *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. v., cap. 5, and *Chronicon*, p. 82, 215. *Xiphilinus*, on *Dion Cassius*, lib. lxxi., cap. 9, 10.—*Tr.*]

(16) *Justin Martyr*, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, p. 49, 278. [*Dion Cassius*, *Hist. Rom.*, l. 69, cap. 12–14.—*Tr.*]

the Christian community. For that turbulent nation had previously been everywhere the accusers of the Christians before the Roman judges; and in Palestine and the neighbouring regions, they had themselves inflicted great injuries upon them, because they refused to aid them in their opposition to the Romans.(17) But this new calamity rendered it not so easy for the Jews, as formerly, to do either of these things.

§ 12. The philosophers and learned men, who came over to the Christians in this century, were no inconsiderable protection and ornament to this holy religion by their discussions, their writings, and their talents. But if any are disposed to question whether the Christian cause received more benefit than injury from these men, I must confess myself unable to decide the point. For the noble simplicity and the majestic dignity of the Christian religion were lost, or, at least, impaired when these philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it, and to bring faith and piety under the dominion of human reason.

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1, 2. The Persecution of Trajan.—§ 3. That of Adrian.—§ 4. That of Antoninus Pius.—§ 5. That of Antoninus Philosophus.—§ 6. Its Calamities.—§ 7. The Reigns of Commodus and Severus.—§ 8. Calumnies against Christians.

§ 1. In the beginning of this century there were no laws in force against the Christians; for those of *Nero* had been repealed by the senate, and those of *Domitian* by his successor *Nerva*. But it had become a common custom to persecute the Christians, and even to put them to death, as often as the pagan priests, or the populace under the instigation of the priests, demanded their destruction. Hence, under the reign of *Trajan*, otherwise a good prince, *popular tumults* were frequently raised in the cities against the Christians, which were fatal to many of them.(1) When therefore such tumults were made in Bithynia, under the propraetor *Pliny* the younger, he thought proper to apply to the emperor for instructions how to treat the Christians. The emperor wrote back that the Christians *were not to be sought after*, but if they were *regularly accused and convicted*, and yet refused to return to the religion of their fathers, they were to be put to death as being bad citizens.(2)

§ 2. This edict of *Trajan*, being registered among the public laws of the Roman empire, set bounds indeed to the fury of the enemies of the Christians, but still it caused the destruction of many of them, even under the best of the emperors. For whenever any one had courage to assume the odious office of an accuser, and the accused did not deny the charge [of

(17) [*Justin Martyr*, Apolog. i., p. 72. —*Schl.*]

(1) *Eusebius*, Historia Eccles., lib. iii., cap. 32.

(2) *Pliny*, Epistol. lib. x., epist. 97, 98;

VOL. I.—O

which epistles many learned men have illustrated by their comments, and especially *Vossius*, *Bochmer*, *Baldwin*, and *Heumann*. [See *Milner's Hist. of the church of Christ*, century ii., ch. i.—*Tr.*]

being a Christian], he might be delivered over to the executioner, unless he apostatized from Christianity. Thus by *Trajan's* law, perseverance in the Christian religion was a capital offence. Under this law, *Simeon* the son of Cleophas and bishop of Jerusalem, a venerable old man, being accused by the Jews, suffered crucifixion.(3) According to the same law, *Trajan* himself ordered the great *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch, to be thrown to wild beasts.(4) For the *kind of death* was left by the law to the pleasure of the judge.

§ 3. Yet this law of *Trajan* was a great restraint to the priests, who wished to oppress the Christians; because few persons were willing to assume the dangerous office of accusers. Under the reign of *Adrian*, therefore, who succeeded *Trajan* A.D. 117, they evaded it by an artifice. For they excited the populace, at the seasons of the public shows and games, to demand with united voice of the presidents and magistrates, the destruction of the Christians; and these public clamours could not be disregarded, without danger of an insurrection.(5) But *Serenus Granianus* the proconsul of Asia, made representation to the emperor, that it was inhuman and unjust to immolate men convicted of no crime, at the pleasure of a furious mob. *Adrian* therefore addressed an edict to the presidents of the provinces, forbidding the Christians to be put to death, unless accused in due form, and convicted of offence against the laws; i. e., as I apprehend, he reinstated the law of *Trajan*.(6) Perhaps also the *Apologies* for the Christians, presented by *Quadratus* and *Aristides*, had an influence on the mind of the emperor.(7)—In this reign, *Bar Chochebas* a pretended king of the Jews, before he was vanquished by *Adrian*, committed great outrages on the Christians, because they would not join his standard.(8)

§ 4. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, the enemies of the Christians assailed them in a new manner; for as the Christians, by the laws of *Adrian*, were to be convicted of some *crime*, and some of the presidents would not admit their *religion* to be a crime, they were accused of impiety or *atheism*. This calumny was met by *Justin Martyr*, in an *Apology* presented to the

(3) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., lib. iii., cap. 32.

(4) See the *Acta martyrii Ignatiani*; published by Ruinart, and in the *Patres Apostolici*, and elsewhere. [See above, p. 92, note (31), and *Milner's* Hist. of the Chh., cent. ii., ch. i., p. 138.—*Tr.*]

(5) [It was an ancient custom or law of the Romans, of which many examples occur in their history, that the people when assembled at the public games, whether at Rome or in the provinces, might demand what they pleased of the emperor or magistrates; which demands could not be rejected. This right, indeed, properly belonged only to Roman citizens, but it was gradually assumed and exercised by others, especially in the larger cities. Hence, when assembled at the public games, the populace could demand the destruction of all Christians, or of any individuals of them whom they pleased; and the magistrates dared not utterly refuse these demands.—Moreover, the abominable lives and doctrines of certain heretics of this age, brought odium on the whole Christian com-

munity; as we are expressly taught by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iv., cap. 7.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 236.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iv., c. 9, and *Fr. Baldwin*, ad Edicta Principum in Christianos, p. 73, &c. [This edict is also given by *Justin Martyr*, Apolog. i., § 68, 69. It was addressed, not only to *Minutius Fundanus* the successor of *Serenus*, but to the other governors of provinces; as we learn from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. iv., c. 26.—*Schl.*]

(7) [These *Apologies* are mentioned by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 3, and *Jerome*, Epist. ad Magnum, Opp., tom. iv., p. 656, ed. Benedict, and de Viris Illustr., c. 19, 20.—From this indulgence of the emperor towards the Christians, arose the suspicion that he himself inclined to their religion. *Lampridius*, Vita Alexandri Severi, cap. 43.—*Schl.*]

(8) *Justin Martyr*, Apolog., ii., p. 72, ed. Colon. [*Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., cap. 21.—*Tr.*]

emperor. And the emperor afterwards decreed that the Christians should be treated according to the law of Adrian.(9) A little after, Asia Minor was visited with earthquakes; and the people regarding the Christians as the cause of their calamities, rushed upon them with every species of violence and outrage. When informed of this, the emperor addressed an edict to the *Common Council of Asia*, denouncing capital punishment against accusers of the Christians, if they could not convict them of some *crime*.(10)

§ 5. *Marcus Antoninus* the philosopher, whom most writers extol immoderately for his wisdom and virtue, did not indeed repeal this decree of his father, or the other laws of the preceding emperors; but he listened too much to the enemies of the Christians, and especially to the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes, and particularly of impiety, of feasting on the flesh of murdered children, (*Thyestearum epularum*), and of incest, (*Oedipodei incestus*). Hence no emperor, after the reign of *Nero*, caused greater evils and calamities to light on Christians than this eminently wise *Marcus Antoninus*; nor was there any emperor, under whom more *Apologies* for the Christians were drawn up, of which those by *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras* and *Tatian*, are still extant.(11)

§ 6. In the first place, this emperor issued unjust edicts against the Christians, whom he regarded as vain, obstinate, deficient in understanding, and strangers to virtue;(12) yet the precise import of these edicts is not now known. In the next place, he allowed the judges, when Christians were accused of the crimes already specified, by servants and by the vilest of persons, to put their prisoners to *torture*; and notwithstanding their most constant denial of the charges alleged against them, to inflict on them capital punishments. For, as the laws would not allow the Christians to be executed without a crime, the judges who wished to condemn them, had to resort to some method of making them appear to be guilty. Hence under this emperor, not only were several very excellent men most unjustly put to death, (among whom were *Polycarp*, the pious bishop of Smyrna, and the celebrated philosopher *Justin*, surnamed *Martyr*), (13) but also sev-

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 26, [where *Melito* tells *Marcus Aurelius*, that his father (*Anton. Pius*) wrote to the Larisseans, the Thessalonians, the Athenians, and to all the Greeks, not to molest the Christians.—*Schl.*]

(10) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 13, [where the edict is given at length. It may also be seen in *Milner*, Hist. of the Chh., cent. ii., ch. ii, vol. i., p. 158, &c., ed. Boston, 1822, where several pious reflections are subjoined.—It has been questioned whether this edict was issued by *Marcus Aurelius*, or by his father, *Antoninus Pius*. *Valesius* (on *Euseb.*, H. Eccl., l. iv., c. 13), decides for the former; and *Mosheim* (de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 240, &c.) is as decisive for the latter. Others have little doubt, that the whole edict is a forgery of some early Christian. For this opinion they urge, that its language is not such as the pagan emperors uniformly use, but is plainly that of an eulogist of the Christians. See *A. Neander's Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i., pt. i.,

p. 151, &c., and *J. C. I. Gieseler's Text-Book of Eccles. Hist.* by *Cunningham*, Philad., 1836, vol. i., p. 79, note 4.—*Tr.*]

(11) [Dr. *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 244, characterizes *Marcus Antoninus* as a well-disposed, but superstitious man; a great scholar, but an indifferent emperor. His persecutions of the Christians arose from his negligence of business, his ignorance of the character of Christians and of Christianity, and from his easy credulity and acquiescence in the wishes of others.—His character is also given by *Milner*. Hist. of the Church, cent. ii., ch. 4, and very elaborately, by *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. i., p. 154, &c.—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Melito*, as quoted by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 26.

(13) The *Acta Martyrii* of both *Polycarp* and *Justin Martyr* are published by *Ruinart*, in his *Acta marty. sincera*. [The former also, in the *Patres Apostol.* The life and martyrdom of *Polycarp*, are the subject of the 5th chapter of *Milner's Hist.* of the

eral Christian churches, and especially those of Lyons and Vienne in France, A.D. 177, were by his order nearly destroyed and obliterated, by various species of executions.(14)

§ 7. Under the reign of *Commodus*, his son, [A.D. 180–192], if we except a few instances of suffering for the renunciation of paganism, no great calamity befel the Christians (15) But when *Severus* was placed on the throne, near the close of the century, much Christian blood was shed in Africa, Egypt, and other provinces. This is certain from the testimonies of *Tertullian*,(16) *Clemens Alexandrinus*,(17) and others; and those must mistake the fact, who say that the Christians enjoyed peace under *Severus*, up to the time when he enacted laws that exposed them to the loss of life and property, which was in the beginning of the next century. For, as the laws of the [former] emperors were not abrogated, and among these, the edicts of *Trajan* and *Marcus Antoninus* were very unjust; it was in the power of the presidents to persecute the Christians with impunity whenever they pleased. These calamities of the Christians near the end of this century, were what induced *Tertullian* [A.D. 198] to compose his *Apologeticum*, and some other works.(18)

§ 8. It will appear less unaccountable, that so holy a people as the Christians should suffer so much persecution, if it be considered that the patrons of the ancient superstition continually assailed them with their railings, calumnies, and libels. Their reproaches and calumnies, of which we have before spoken, are recounted by the writers of the Apologies. The Christians were attacked, in a book written expressly against them by *Celsus*; the philosopher whom *Origen*, in his confutation of him, represents as an Epicurean, but whom we for substantial reasons believe to be a Platonist of the sect of *Ammonius*.(19) This miserable sophist deals in slander, as *Origen's* answer to him shows; nor does he so much attack the Christians, as play off his wit; which is not distinguished for elegance and refinement. *Fronto*, the rhetorician, also made some attempts against the Christians; but these have perished, with the exception of a bare mention

Chh., century ii., vol. i., p. 176, &c., ed. Boston, 1822, as those of *Justin Martyr*, are of ch. iii. of the same vol., p. 161, &c.—*Tr.*]

(14) See the Letter of the Christians at Lyons giving account of this persecution, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. 2, [also in *Fox*, Book of Martyrs, and in *Milner's* History of the Church, cent. ii., ch. vi., vol. i., p. 185, &c., ed. Boston, 1822.—*Tr.*]

(15) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. v., cap. 24, and 16, 18, 19.

(16) [*Tertullian*, ad Scapulam, cap. 4, and *Apologet.*, cap 5., which show that *Severus* himself was, at first, favourable to the Christians. But the same *Apologeticum*, cap. 35, 49, and 7, 12, 30, 37, shows that Christians suffered before the enactment of the laws.—*Schl.*]

(17) [*Clemens Alex.*, Stromat., l. ii., p. 494.—*Schl.* See also the account of the

martyrs of Scillita in Africa, A.D. 200, in *Ruinart's Acta Martyr.* *Baronius* Ann., A.D. 200, and *Milner*, Hist. of the Chh., vol. i., p. 236.—*Tr.*]

(18) I have expressly treated of this subject in my diss. de vera aetate *Apologetici Tertulliani et initio persecutionis Severi*; which is the first essay in my *Syntagma Diss. ad hist. eccles. pertinentium*.

(19) [See *Mosheim's* preface to the German translation of *Origen's* work.—*Tr.* “The learned *Dr. Lardner* does not think it possible, that *Celsus* could have been of the sect of *Ammonius*; since the former lived and wrote in the second century, whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And indeed, we have from *Origen* himself, that he knew of two only of the name of *Celsus*, one who lived in the time of *Nero*, and the other in the reign of *Adrian*, and afterwards. The latter was the philosopher, who wrote against Christianity.”—*Macl.*]

of them by *Minutius Felix*.(20) To these may be added *Crescens*, a Cynic philosopher, who, though he seems to have written nothing against the Christians, yet was very eager to do them harm, and in particular did not cease to persecute *Justin Martyr*, till he compassed his death.(21)

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY.

§ 1. State of Learning in general.—§ 2, 3. Learned Men.—§ 4. Rise of the New Platonics.—§ 5. Eclectics at Alexandria.—§ 6. Approved by the Christians.—§ 7. Ammonius Saccas.—§ 8. His fundamental Principles.—§ 9. His principal Doctrines.—§ 10. His austere System of Moral Discipline.—§ 11. His Opinions concerning God and Christ.—§ 12. Ill Effects of this Philosophy on Christianity.—§ 13. The State of Learning among Christians.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH literature seemed in some measure to recover its former dignity and lustre, during the reign of *Trajan*,(1) yet it could not long retain its influence under the subsequent emperors, who were indisposed to patronise it. The most learned among these Roman sovereigns, *Marcus Antoninus*, showed favour only to the philosophers, and especially to the Stoics; the other arts and sciences, he, like the Stoics, held in contempt.(2)

(20) *Minutius Felix*, Octavins, p. 266, ed. Herald.—[*Minutius* mentions this calumniator in two passages, namely, chap. 10, p. 99, and chap. 31, p. 322; in the former of which, he calls him *Cirtensis noster*; implying, that he was of *Cirta*, in Africa; in the latter passage, he speaks of him as an *orator*, indicating what profession he followed. It has been supposed by the learned, and not without reason, that this *Fronto* was *Cornelius Fronto* the rhetorician, who instructed *Marcus Antoninus* in eloquence, (and whose works were first published A.D. 1816, by *Aug. Maius*, Frankf. on Mayn, in 2 parts). So long as the Christian community was made up of unlearned persons, the philosophers despised them. But when, in the second century, some eminent philosophers became Christians, as *Justin*, *Athenagoras*, *Pantænus*, and others, who retained the name, garb, and mode of living of philosophers, and who became teachers of youth, and while they gave a philosophical aspect to Christianity, exposed the vanity of the pagan philosophy, and the shameless lives of those

addicted to it; the pagan philosophers perceiving their reputations and their interests to be at stake, now joined the populace and the priests in persecuting the Christians in general; and they especially assailed the Christian philosophers with their calumnies and accusations. Their chief motive was, not the love of truth, but their own reputation, influence, glory, worldly interest, and advantage; just the same causes as had before moved the pagan priests. This war of the philosophers commenced in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, who was himself addicted to philosophy. And it is easy to see, what induced him to listen to his brother philosophers, and at their instigation to allow the Christians to be persecuted. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 256, &c. —Tr.]

(21) *Justin Martyr*, Apologia ii., p. 21, ed. Oxon. *Tatian*, Orat. contra Graecos, p. 72, ed. Worthii.

(1) *Pliny*, Epistles, lib. iii., ep. 18, p. 134, 135, ed. Cortii et Longolii.

(2) *Marcus Antoninus*, Meditations, or,

Hence the literary productions of this age among the Romans, are far inferior to those of the preceding century, in elegance, brilliance, and good taste.

§ 2. Yet there were men of excellent genius, among both Greeks and Romans, who wrote well on almost every branch of learning then cultivated. Among the Greeks, *Plutarch* was particularly eminent. He was a man of various, but ill-digested learning; and besides was tainted with the principles of the academics. Rhetoricians, sophists, and grammarians had schools in all the more considerable towns of the Roman empire; in which they pretended to train up youth for public life, by various exercises and declamations. But those educated in these schools, were vain, loquacious, and formed for display; rather than truly eloquent, wise, and competent to transact business. Hence the sober and considerate looked with contempt, on the education acquired in the schools of these teachers. There were two public academies, one at *Rome* founded by *Adrian*, in which all the sciences were taught, but especially jurisprudence; the other at *Berytus* in Phœnicia, in which jurists were principally educated.(3)

§ 3. Many philosophers of all the different sects, flourished at this time; but to enumerate them belongs rather to other works than to this.(4) The Stoic sect had the honour of embracing two great men, *Marcus Antoninus*, the emperor, and *Epictetus* (5) But each of them had more admirers than disciples and followers; nor were the Stoics, according to history, held in the highest estimation in this age. There were larger numbers in the schools of the Platonists; among other reasons, because they were less austere, and because their doctrines were more in accordance with the common notions respecting the gods. But no sect appears to have numbered more adherents than the Epicureans; whose precepts led to an indulgent, secure and voluptuous life.(6)

§ 4. Near the close of this century, a new philosophical sect suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity.(7) Egypt was its birthplace, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called *Platonics*. Yet they did not follow *Plato* implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views. And the ground of their preference for the name of *Platonics*, was, that they conceived *Plato* had explained more correctly than all others, that most important branch of philosophy which treats of God and supersensible things.

§ 5. That controversial spirit in philosophy, which obliges every one to

ad se ipsum, lib. i., § 7, p. 3, 4, § 17, p. 17, ed. Lips.

(3) *M. Antoninus*, Meditations, or, ad se ipsum, lib. i., § 7, 10, 17, p. 4, 7, 16, ed. Lips. [See *Giannone*, Istoria Civile di Napoli, lib. i., c. 10.—*Tr.*]

(4) *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Trypho., Opp., p. 218, &c. Many of the philosophers of this age are mentioned by *M. Antoninus*, Meditat., or, ad se ipsum, lib. i.

(5) [Concerning *Marcus Antoninus*, see *Brucker's* Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 578, and for *Epictetus*, *ibid.*, p. 568.—*Schl. Staedlin*, Gesch. der Moralphilos., p. 265,

&c., treats of *M. Antoninus*; and *ibid.*, p. 260, &c., of *Epictetus*.—*Tr.*]

(6) *Lucian*, Pseudomantis; Opp., tom. i., p. 763.

(7) [See *Dr. Mosheim's* Commentat. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia, in his syntagma Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent., vol. i., p. 85, &c.; and *Brucker's* Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 162, &c.—*Schl.* And, on the contrary, *C. A. T. Keil*, Exercitatt. xviii. de Doctoribus veteris eccles. culpâ corruptæ per Platonicas sententias theologiæ, liberandis, Lips., 1793—1807, 4to.—*Tr.*]

swear allegiance to the dogmas of his master, was disapproved by the more wise. Hence among the lovers of truth, and the men of moderation, a new class of philosophers had grown up in Egypt, who avoided altercation and a sectarian spirit, and who professed simply to follow truth, gathering up whatever was accordant with it in all the philosophic schools. They assumed therefore the name of *Eclectics*. But notwithstanding these philosophers were really the partisans of no sect, yet it appears from a variety of testimonies, that they much preferred *Plato*, and embraced most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe.(8)

§ 6. This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria, (*Athenagoras*, *Pantænus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*,) are said to have approved of it.(9) These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defence of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent their regarding *Plato* as wiser than all others, and as having advanced sentiments concerning God, the soul, and supersensible things, more accordant with the principles of Christianity than any other.(10)

§ 7. This [eclectic] mode of philosophizing was changed near the close of the century, when *Ammonius Saccas* with great applause, opened a school at Alexandria, and laid the foundation of that sect which is called the *New Platonic*. This man was born and educated a Christian, and perhaps made pretensions to Christianity all his life.(11) Being possessed

(8) [See *Brucker's Hist. crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 189, &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) The title and dignity of philosopher so much delighted those good men, that, when made presbyters, they would not abandon the philosopher's cloak and dress. See *Origen's* letter to Eusebius, Opp., tom. i., p. 2, ed. de la Rue. [*Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Trypho. initium. For proof that *Pantænus* studied philosophy, see *Origen*, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 19. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr., cap. 20. The proficiency of *Athenagoras* in philosophy, appears from his *Apology*, and his *Essay on the Resurrection*. That *Clemens Alex.* was much addicted to philosophy, is very evident; see his *Stromata*, passim.—Concerning the Alexandrian Christian school, see *Herm. Conringius*, Antiquitates Academicæ, p. 29. *J. A. Schmidt*, Diss. prefixed to *A. Hyperii* Libellum de Catechesi. *Domin. Aulsius*, delle Scuole sacre, libr. ii., cap. 1, 2, 21. *Geo. Langemack*, Historia Catechismorum, pt. i., p. 86.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 273, &c.—*Tr.*]

(10) [This cultivation of philosophy by Christian teachers, greatly displeased those

who were attached to the ancient simple faith, as taught by *Christ* and his apostles; for they feared what afterward actually happened, that the purity and excellence of divine truth would suffer by it. Hence the Christians were divided into two parties, the friends of philosophy and human learning, and the opposers of them. The issue of the long contest between them, was, that the advocates of philosophy prevailed.—Traces of this controversy may be seen in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., c. 28; and in *Clemens Alex.*, Stromat., lib. i., cap. 1-5.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M., p. 276, &c.—*Tr.*]

(11) [The history of the philosopher *Ammonius* is involved in great obscurity. All that could be gathered from antiquity respecting him, is given by *Brucker*, Historia crit. philos., tom. ii., p. 205. See also *J. A. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, lib. iv., c. 26. Whether *Ammonius* continued a professed Christian, or apostatized, has been much debated. *Porphyry*, who studied under *Plotinus*, a disciple of *Ammonius*, (as quoted by *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 19), says, he was born of Christian parents,

of great fecundity of genius as well as eloquence, he undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony; or, in other words, to teach a philosophy, by which all philosophers, and the men of all religions, the Christian not excepted, might unite together and have fellowship. And here especially, lies the difference between this new sect, and the *eclectic* philosophy which had before flourished in Egypt. For the *Eclectics* held that there was a *mixture* of good and bad, true and false, in all the systems; and therefore they *selected* out of all, what appeared to them consonant with reason, and rejected the rest. But *Ammonius* held that all sects professed *one and the same system* of truth, with only some difference in the *mode of stating* it, and some minute difference in their conceptions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might with little difficulty be brought into one body.(12) He moreover held this new and singular principle, that the popular religions, and likewise the Christian, must be understood and explained according to this common philosophy of all the sects; and that the fables of the vulgar pagans and their priests, and so too the interpretations of the disciples of *Christ*, ought to be separated from their respective religions.

§ 8. The grand object of *Ammonius*, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, philosophers, priests, and Christians; and particularly, by means of allegorical interpretations, to remove very many impediments out of his way. The manner in which he prosecuted his object, appears in the writings of his disciples and adherents; which have come down to us in great abundance. To make the arduous work more easy, he assumed that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians by *Hermes*.(13) and

but when he came to mature years, embraced the religion of the laws, i. e., the pagan religion. *Eusebius* taxes *Porphyry* with falsehood in this; and says, that *Ammonius* continued a Christian till his death, as appears from his books, one of which was on the accordance of *Moses* with *Jesus Christ*. *Jerome*, de *Scriptoribus Illustr.*, cap. 55, says nearly the same. *Valesius*, *Bayle*, *Basnage*, and Dr. *Mosheim*, (when he wrote his essay de ecclesia turbata per recentiores Platonicos), agreed with *Eusebius* and *Jerome*. But when he wrote his *Commentarii* de Reb. Christ., Dr. *Mosheim* fell in with the opinion of *Fabrieius*, *Bruckner*, and others, (and which is now the general opinion), that *Eusebius* and *Jerome* confounded *Ammonius* the philosopher, with another *Ammonius*, the reputed author of a harmony of the Gospels, and other works; because it can hardly be supposed, that this enthusiastic admirer of philosophy, would have found time or inclination for composing such books. Besides, it is said, *Ammonius* the philosopher published *no books*. Still the question remains, what were the religious character and creed of this philosopher, in his maturer years? Dr. *Mosheim* thinks it probable, he did not

openly renounce Christianity, but endeavoured to accommodate himself to the feelings of all parties; and therefore he was claimed by both pagans and Christians. Hence, if he *was* a Christian, he was a very inconsistent one, and did much injury to its cause.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 231.—*Tr.*]

(12) [The views of this sect are very clearly expressed by *Julian*, who was a great devotee of this philosophy, *Orat.* vi., contra Cynicos, *Opp.*, p. 184.—*Schl.* In accordance with the prevalent views of the oriental Platonists, “these philosophers, like the Christian Gnostics, supposed all essential truth to be derived, not from a process of thought, but from direct inward perception.” *Gieseler's* Text-book, translated by Cunningham, vol. i., p. 112. See also *Tennemann's* *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.*, ed. Leipzig., 1829, § 200–202.—*Tr.*]

(13) [This appears from the writings of all his followers, *Plotinus*, *Proclus*, *Porphyry*, *Damascius*, *Simplicius*, and others. And the learned, not without reason, conjecture that all the works of *Hermes* and *Zoroaster*, which we now have, originated in the schools of these New Platonics.—*Schl.*]

thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still by *Plato*, the best interpreter of the principles of *Hermes* and of the ancient oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied; (14) that the religions received by the various nations of the world were not inconsistent with this most ancient philosophy; yet that it had most unfortunately happened, that what the ancients taught by symbols and fictitious stories in the manner of the Orientals, had been understood literally by the people and the priests; and thus, the ministers of divine providence, (those *demons* whom the supreme Lord of all had placed over the various parts of our world), had erroneously been converted into gods, and had been worshipped with many vain ceremonies; that therefore the public religions of all nations should be corrected by this ancient philosophy: and that it was the sole object of *Christ* to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and correct the errors which had crept into religion, but not to abolish altogether the ancient religions.

§ 9. To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians, (among whom he was born and educated), concerning the universe and the deity, as constituting *one great whole*, [*Pantheism*]; (15) concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines, all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. For it is most evident that the ancient philosophy of the Egyptians, which they pretended to have learned from *Hermes*, was the *basis* of the New Platonic or Ammonian; and the book of *Jamblichus*, de *Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, is sufficient evidence of the fact. In the next place, with these Egyptian notions he united the philosophy of *Plato*; which he accomplished with little difficulty, by distorting some of the principles of *Plato*, and by putting a false construction on his language. (16) Finally, the dogmas of the other sects he construed, as far as was possible, by means of art, ingenuity, and the aid of allegories, into apparent coincidence with these Egyptian and Platonic principles.

§ 10. To this Egyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, the ingenious and fanatical man joined a system of moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. He permitted the common people, indeed, to live according to the laws of their country and the dictates of nature; but he directed the wise to elevate, by contemplation, their souls, which were the offspring of God, above all earthly things; and to weaken and emaciate their bodies, which were hostile to the liberty of their souls, by means of hunger, thirst, labour, and other austerities; (17) so that they might in the pres-

(14) [*Jamblichus*, de *Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*, l. i., c. 1, 2.—*Schl.*]

(15) [On this principle the whole philosophy of the ancient Egyptians was founded; and on it *Ammonius* erected his system. The book which goes under the title of *Hermes Trismegisti Sermo de Natura Deorum*, ad *Asclepium*, which is extant in Latin among the works of *Apuleius*, the supposed translator, is evidence of this fact. See also *Eusebius*, *Præparatio evangel.*, lib. iii., c. 9, and the note on *Cudworth's Intell. System*, tom. i., p. 404, &c. And the same fundamental principle is assumed by *Plotinus*,

Proclus, *Simplicius*, *Jamblichus*, and all the New Platonics. See, for example, *Porphyry*, in his *life of Plotinus*, cap. ii., p. 94.—*Schl.*]

(16) [The principle of the Ammonian and Egyptian philosophy, that God and the world constitute *one indivisible whole*, it cost him much labour to reduce to harmony with the system of *Plato*; who, as we learn from his *Timæus*, taught the eternal existence of matter, as a substance distinct from God. See *Proclus* on the *Timæus* of *Plato*.—*Schl.*]

(17) [See *Porphyry*, de *Abstinentia*, lib. i., c. 27, &c., p. 22-34.—*Schl.*]

ent life, attain to communion with the Supreme Being, and might ascend after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal parent, and be forever united with him. And, being born and educated among Christians, *Ammonius* was accustomed to give elegance and dignity to these precepts by using forms of expression borrowed from the sacred scriptures; and hence these forms of expression occur abundantly in the writings of his followers.(18) To this austere discipline, he superadded the art of so purging and improving the imaginative faculty, as to make it capable of seeing the demons, and of performing many wonderful things by their assistance. His followers called this art *Theurgy*.(19) Yet it was not cultivated by all the philosophers of *Ammonius*' school, but only by the more eminent.(20)

§ 11. That the prevailing religions, and particularly the Christian, might not appear irreconcilable with his system, *Ammonius* first turned the whole history of the pagan gods into allegory,(21) and maintained that those whom the vulgar and the priests honoured with the title of *Gods*, were only the *ministers* of God, to whom some homage might and should be paid, yet such as would not derogate from the superior homage due to the Supreme God;(22) and in the next place he admitted that *Christ* was an extraordinary man, the friend of God, and an admirable *Theurge*.(23) He denied that *Christ* aimed wholly to suppress the worship of the demons, those ministers of divine providence; that, on the contrary, he only sought to wipe away the stains, contracted by the ancient religions;(24) and that his disciples had corrupted and vitiated the system of their master.(25)

(18) [See examples in *Hierocles*, on the golden verses of Pythagoras; and in *Simplicius* and *Jamblichus*. See also *Mosheim's* Diss. de studio Ethnicorum Christianos imitandi, in vol. i. of his Diss. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinent., p. 321.—*Schl.*]

(19) [This worthless science is very similar to what has been called *allowable magic*, and which is distinguished from necromancy, or unlawful magic. It was undoubtedly of Egyptian origin. As the Egyptians imagined the whole world to be full of good and evil spirits, they might easily be led to suppose there must be some way to secure the favour of these demons. See *Augustine*, de Civit. Dei, l. x., c. 9, Opp., tom. vii., p. 187.—*Schl.* “*Theurgy* is the science concerning the gods and the various classes of superior spirits, their appearing to men and their operations; and *the art*, by means of certain acts, habits, words, and symbols, of moving the gods to impart to men secrets which surpass the powers of reason, to lay open to them the future, and to become visible to them. This *theurgy*, which goes farther and rises higher than *philosophy*, was first imparted and revealed to men in ancient times, by the gods themselves, and was afterwards preserved among the priests. So it is described in the book which bears the name of *Jamblichus*, de Mysteriis Aegyptiorum, lib. i., c. 26–29.” *Staeudlin*, Geschichte der Moralphilosophie, p. 462.—*Tr.*]

(20) [See concerning the moral system of the new Platonics, in all its material parts, *Staeudlin*, Geschichte der Moralphilosophie, p. 435, &c.—*Tr.*]

(21) [See, for example, *Porphry*, de Antro Nymphar. apud Homerum de styge, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) [*Paul Orosius*, Historia, lib. vi., cap. 1, p. 364, 365.—*Schl.*]

(23) [It cannot be denied that the sect of *Ammonius* embraced some, who were enemies of *Christ* and of the Christians. The emperor *Julian*, and some others, are proof of this. But *Ammonius* himself honoured *Christ*. And *Augustine* contended against some philosophers of his time, who, as followers of *Ammonius*, honoured *Christ*, yet maintained that the Christians had corrupted his doctrine; de Consensu Evangelistarum, Opp., tom. iii., pt. ii., lib. 1, c. 6, § 11, p. 5, and c. 8, § 14, p. 6, and c. 15, p. 8.—*Schl.*]

(24) [*Augustine*, de Consensu Evangel., lib. i., c. 16, p. 8, and c. 24, p. 18. Yet they admitted that *Christ* abolished the worship of certain demons of an inferior order, and enjoined upon men to pray to the celestial gods, and especially to the Supreme God. This is evident from a passage of *Porphry*, quoted by *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, lib. xix., c. 23, § 4, Opp., tom. vii., p. 430.—*Schl.*]

(25) What we have stated in these sec-

§ 12. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by *Origen* and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour not a few things, of which not a word can be found in the Holy Scriptures. It also produced that gloomy set of men, called *mystics*; whose system, if divested of its Platonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life, which was afterwards adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of *monks*; and it recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally, it alienated the minds of many in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined. And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious effects, which arose from this new philosophy; or, if you please, from [this *Syncretismus*] this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other?

§ 13. The number of learned men among the Christians, which was small in the preceding century, was larger in this. And yet we scarcely find among them, rhetoricians, sophists, and orators. Most of those who obtained some reputation among them by their learning, were philosophers: and they, as before stated, followed the principles of the *Eclectics*, and gave *Plato* preference before others. But all Christians were not agreed as to the utility of learning and philosophy. Those who were themselves initiated in the mysteries of philosophy, wished that many, and especially such as aspired to the office of pastors and teachers, might apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, so that they might confute the enemies of truth with more effect, and teach and instruct others with more success. But a great majority thought otherwise; they wished to banish all reasoning and philosophy out of the confines of the church; for they feared that such learning would injure piety. At this time, therefore, broke out the war between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *intelligence*; which has been protracted, through all succeeding centuries, down to our own times, and which we by all our efforts cannot easily bring to an end. By degrees, those obtained the ascendancy, who thought that philosophy and erudition were profitable, rather than hurtful to religion and piety; and rules were at length established, that no person entirely illiterate or unlearned, should be admitted to the office of teacher in the church. Yet the vices of the philosophers and learned men, among other causes,

tions respecting the doctrines of *Ammonius*, we have collected from the books and discussions of his followers, who are called *New Platonics*. *Ammonius* himself left no writings; and he forbid his followers ever publishing his doctrines, but they did not obey him. See *Porphyrus*, *Vita Plotini*, cap. 3, p. 97, ed. *Fabricii*, lib. iv., *Biblioth. Græca*. Yet there can be no doubt, that all we have stated was invented by *Ammonius* himself, whom the whole family of the

New Platonies constantly affirm to have been the author of their philosophy.—[Dr. *Mosheim*, in his *Commentarii de Rebus Christ. ante Constantin. M.*, § 27–32, p. 280–298, has given a more full account of *Ammonius* and his doctrines, and has cited, particularly, his chief authorities; but the substance of his statements is contained in the preceding sections, and his most important authorities are referred to in the notes of *Schlegel*, which are all here preserved.—*Tr.*]

prevented the opposite party from ever being destitute of patrons and advocates. Ample proof of this will be found in the history of the following centuries.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The form of Church Government.—§ 2. Union of Churches in a Province. Origin of Councils.—§ 3. Their too great Authority gave rise to Metropolitans and Patriarchs.—§ 4. Parallel between the Jewish and Christian Priesthood.—§ 5. The principal Writers.

§ 1. THE form of church government which began to exist in the preceding century, was in this century more industriously established and confirmed, in all its parts. One president, or *bishop*, presided over each church. He was created by the common suffrage of the whole people. With the *presbyters* for his council, whose number was not fixed, it was his business to watch over the interests of the whole church, and to assign to each *presbyter* his station. Subject to the bishop and also to the presbyters, were the servants or *deacons*, who were divided into certain classes, because all the duties which the interests of the church required, could not well be attended to by them all.

§ 2. During a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent* of each other, or were connected by no consociations or confederations.(1) Each church was a kind of small independent republic, governing itself by its own laws, enacted or at least sanctioned by the people. But in process of time, it became customary for all the Christian churches within the same province, to unite and form a sort of larger society or commonwealth; and in the manner of confederated republics, to hold their conventions at stated times, and there deliberate for the common advantage of the whole confederation. This custom first arose among the Greeks, with whom a [political] confederation of cities, and the consequent conventions of their several delegates, had been long known; but afterwards the utility of the thing being seen, the custom extended through all countries where there were Christian churches.(2) Such

(1) [Yet by ancient custom, peculiar respect was paid to the churches founded and governed by the apostles themselves; and such churches were appealed to in controversies on points of doctrine, as most likely to know what the apostles had taught. See *Irenaeus*, adv. Haeres., lib. iii., c. 3, and *Tertullian*, de Praescript. adv. Haeres., c. 36. Thus *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 258.—Tr.]

(2) *Tertullian*, de Jejuniiis, cap. 13, p. 711, [where we have this very important statement: *Aguntur praeterea per Graecias, illa certis in locis Concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis*

Christiani magnâ veneratione celebratur. From this passage of *Tertullian*, which was written near the beginning of the *third* century, Dr. *Mosheim* (de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 266, &c.), infers, 1, that provincial councils had not then been held in Africa, nor anywhere except among the *Greeks*; 2, that councils were considered as human institutions, and as acting only by *human authority*; 3, that the provincial councils were held always in the *same places—certis in locis*; 4, that they did not interfere with the *private concerns* of individual churches, which were left to their own management; but conferred only on *greater matters*, or such as were of *common interest—altiora—tractantur*; 5,

conventions of delegates from several churches assembled for deliberation, were called by the Greeks *Synods*, and by the Latins *Councils*; and the laws agreed upon in them, were called *canons*, that is, *rules*.

§ 3. These councils,—of which no vestige appears before the middle of this century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For by them, in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were very much abridged; and, on the other hand, the influence and authority of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first, the bishops did not deny, that they were merely the representatives of their churches, and that they acted in the name of the people; but by little and little, they made higher pretensions, and maintained that power was given them by *Christ* himself, to *dictate* rules of faith and conduct to the people. In the next place, the perfect equality and parity of all bishops, which existed in the early times, these councils gradually subverted. For it was necessary that one of the confederated bishops of a province should in those conventions be intrusted with some authority and power over the others; and hence originated the prerogatives of *Metropolitans*. And lastly, when the custom of holding these councils had extended over the Christian world, and the universal church had acquired the form of a vast republic composed of many lesser ones, certain head men were to be placed over it in different parts of the world, as central points in their respective countries. Hence came the *Patriarchs*; and ultimately a *Prince of Patriarchs*, the Roman pontiff.

§ 4. To the whole order of men who conducted the affairs of the church, no small honour and profit accrued, from the time they succeeded in persuading the people to regard them as *successors* of the Jewish priests. This took place not long after the reign of *Adrian*, when, upon the second destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews lost all hope of seeing their commonwealth restored. The *bishops* now wished to be thought to correspond with the high priests of the Jews; the *presbyters* were said to come in place of the priests; and the *deacons* were made parallel with the Levites. Those who first drew this parallel between offices so totally different, probably made the misrepresentation, not so much from design as from ignorance.

that the attending bishops acted as *representatives of their churches*, and not as men clothed with authority from heaven, by virtue of their office—*representatio totius nominis Christiani*. From Greece, the custom of meeting in councils extended into Syria and Palestine. *Euseb.*, Hist. Eccl., l. v., c. 23. We have no certain accounts of any councils till after the middle of the second century. The earliest of which we have authentic notice, were those which deliberated concerning the *Montanists*, about A.D. 170 or 173, (*Euseb.*, H. E., v. 16), and the next were those assembled to consider the proper time for *Easter*.—(*Euseb.*, H. E., v. 23.) All these councils are placed by *Eusebius*, under the reign of *Commodus*, or A.D. 180–192. In the third century, councils became frequent. Provincial councils were now held, perhaps throughout the Christian world; and special councils were

called, as occasion required. Originally these councils had no jurisdiction; but were mere conventions of delegates, met to consider and agree upon matters of common concernment. But they soon began to claim power; to enact and enforce laws, and to hear and decide controversies. And the *bishops*, instead of appearing as the representatives of their churches, claimed authority from *Christ*, to bind and control the churches. See *W. C. Zeigler*, on the Origin of Synods, in *Henken's Nenen Magazin*, band i., st. i. *G. J. Planck's Geschichte der christl. kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung*, period ii., chap. v., vol. i., p. 90, &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml., Introd., § 3, 4, and b. i., ch. i., sect. ii., p. 82, &c., ch. ii., p. 118, &c.—*Jos. Bingham*, Origines Eccles., vol. vii., p. 45, &c., and *Sir P. King*, Constitution, &c., of the Prim. Church, ch. 8.—*Tr.*]

But this idea being once introduced and approved, drew after it other errors, among which I will mention only this, that it established a wider difference between teachers and learners than accords with the nature of the Christian religion.(3)

§ 5. Among the doctors of this century, whose writings rendered them particularly famous in after ages, was *Justin Martyr*; a converted philosopher, who had dipped into nearly every sect in philosophy. He was pious, and possessed considerable learning, but he was sometimes an incautious disputant, and was ignorant of ancient history. We have among other works of his, two *Apologies* for the Christians, which are justly held in great estimation.(4) *Irenæus*, bishop of Lyons in France, whose only

(3) [This comparison of Christian teachers with the Jewish priesthood, among other consequences, led the former to lay claim to *tithes* and *first fruits*; of which we find mention, before the times of *Constantine*. Perhaps a desire to increase their revenues, which were both small and precarious, led some of the bishops to apply Jewish law to the Christian church. That they claimed *first fruits*, as of divine right, in this century, is clear from *Irenæus*, contra Hæres., l. iv., c. 17 and 34. That *tithes* were not yet claimed, at least in the Latin church, appears from the latter of these passages in *Irenæus*. Yet in the Greek and Oriental churches, tithes began to be claimed earlier than among the Latins; and probably in this *second* century, for the Greek writers of the *third* century, and the apostolic constitutions, (which seem to contain the ecclesiastical laws of the *Greek* church), mention tithes as a thing then well known.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 271.—*Tr.*]

(4) [*Justin Martyr*, was the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, pagan Grecians, settled at Flavia Neapolis, (Naples), the ancient Sichem in Samaria. See *Apolog.* i., c. i. He had successive masters in philosophy, Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and lastly Platonic. He travelled much, and was very eager in the pursuit of knowledge, and especially respecting the Divine Being. When about 23 years old, as is conjectured, and about A.D. 137, he was converted to Christianity, in consequence of being directed by an aged Christian, to go to the Bible, as the source of true philosophy. He afterwards spent most of his time at Rome; where he lived as a Christian philosopher, and devoted all his talents to the furtherance of the gospel. At last, about A.D. 168, he suffered martyrdom, one *Creseens*, a pagan philosopher, being his accuser, and on the simple charge of his being a Christian. His writings are numerous, erudite, all of them theological, and all of a polemic character. His style is harsh and inelegant, his temper is ardent and decisive, and his arguments and

opinions not always satisfactory. Yet being the first of the learned divines, and a very zealous and active Christian, he merits our particular attention. His life and writings are described by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iv., c. 11, 12, 16–18. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 23. *Photius*, *Biblioth.*, ccxxxii., and others among the ancients; and by *Cave*, *Du Pin*, *Longerue*, *Maran*, *Milner*, (*Hist. of the Chh.*, vol. i., p. 161, &c., ed. Boston, 1822.) *J. Kaye*, (account of the writings and opinions of *Justin Martyr*, Lond., 1829, 8vo), a writer in the *Christian Examiner*, for Nov., Cambridge, 1829; and others among the moderns.—About A.D. 140, or as some think, much later in life, he composed two learned treatises against the pagans, as we learn from *Eusebius*, (*Hist. Eccl.*, iv., 18), and *Jerome*, (*ubi sup.*), which are generally supposed to be the *Cohortatio ad Græcos*, and *Oratio ad Græcos*, still found in his printed works. The substance of the former, which is the largest, is this: “The Greeks have no sources of certain and satisfactory knowledge of religion. What their poets state concerning the gods is ridiculous and absurd. *Jupiter*, for example, according to *Homer*, would have been incarcerated by the other gods, if they had not feared *Briareus*. And *Jupiter* himself betrayed his weakness by his amours. *Mars* and *Venus* were wounded by *Diomedes*, &c. *Thales* derived all things from water; *Anaximenes*, from air; *Heracitus*, from fire, &c. But it is not possible for the human mind to search out divine things; it needs aid from above; it must be moved by the divine Spirit, as the lyre must by the plectrum. This was the fact with the Hebrew prophets; who besides, were much older than the Grecian poets, lawgivers, and philosophers. Even the heathen writers admit the high antiquity of the Jewish legislation, e. g., *Polemon*, *Appion*, *Ptolemy Mendesius*, *Hellanicus*, &c., and *Philo*, *Josephus*, and *Diodorus Siculus* confirms it. An Egyptian king, *Ptolemy* (Philadelphus), therefore, caused the ancient Hebrew books to be translated into Greek,

remaining writings are his five Books against the Heretics ; which, though preserved only in a Latin translation from the original Greek, are a splen-

by 70 men, who were enclosed in as many separate cells ; when they had finished their translations, they were found perfectly agreeing, not only in the sense but in the words. Justin himself had seen the vestiges of these cells. The Greeks derived their best thoughts from the Hebrews. Thus *Orpheus*, *Homer*, *Solon*, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato*, are known to have acquired their best knowledge in Egypt. Hence, *Orpheus*, the *Sibyls*, *Homer*, *Sophocles*, &c., were enabled to write about the unity of God, the judgment after death, &c. When *Plato*, for instance, says : Virtue must be *given* to men by the Deity ; he borrowed the idea from the prophets ; and to conceal the fact, he substituted *virtue* in place of the *Holy Spirit*. When he says : Time began with heaven ; it is clear that he borrowed from *Moses*' writings, &c. Since therefore, the Grecian philosophers themselves confess their ignorance, and the *Sibyls* direct to the coming of *Christ*, men should go to the prophets, as to the source of all truth."—The shorter work, entitled *Oratio ad Græcos*, is similar in its contents. Indeed, this may serve as a fair specimen of the ground taken by the Christian fathers generally, in their controversies with learned pagans. About A.D. 150, or as some think, 10 or 12 years earlier, *Justin* presented his earliest or long *Apology* for the Christians to the emperor *Antoninus Pius* : and a little before his death, or after A.D. 160, his other *Apology*, an imperfect copy of which is improperly called his *first Apology*. The substance of the larger *Apology*, which is written with little method, is this : "Why are Christians condemned merely for their name, without inquiry whether they are malefactors ? Let *this* be investigated ; then punish the guilty, and let the innocent go free. The Christians are accused of *atheism* ; but unjustly. They worship God the Father, the Son, and the prophetic or divine Spirit. They offer indeed no sacrifices ; but they believe God requires none. Christians are ridiculed for expecting a kingdom of *Christ* ; but unjustly. The kingdom which they expect, is not an earthly kingdom ; if it *were*, how could they so cheerfully meet death ? Christianity is not so totally unlike everything believed by the pagans. The pagans expect a judgment after death ; so do the Christians. The former make *Rhadamanthus* the judge ; the latter, *Jesus Christ*. The pagans believe, that many men were sons of *Jupiter* ; Christians believe, that *Jesus* was the Son of *God*. The pagans assert, that *Æsculapius* healed

the sick in a wonderful manner ; Christians assert the same of *Christ*, &c. The ground of this correspondence lies in this, that the demons, who are the authors of the pagan religions, and to whom the pagan worship is paid, copied beforehand the history of *Christ*, in order to prejudice the truth. Yet they omitted to copy the *cross*, which is the appropriate sign of the power of *Christ* ; (and therefore it is found indispensable in nature, e. g., in the yards of a ship.) Also, by the ascent of *Simon Magus* to heaven, they sought to imitate the ascension of *Christ* ; and since the Romans themselves have erected a statue to this *Simon* as a god ; they should more readily do the same to *Christ*. Christianity is *true*. This is demonstrable from the prophecies of the Old Testament. (Here again, the antiquity of the Old Testament is asserted ; and the principle maintained, that the Greeks borrowed from the Hebrews.) Also, the prophecies of *Christ*, concerning his ascension to heaven, and the destruction of Jerusalem, which have been fulfilled, prove the truth of Christianity. *Christ* is the *Logos*, (the *reason* or *intelligence*) of which all men participate ; so that every one who has ever lived according to *Logos*, (*reason*), was a Christian. The demons, whose worship is prostrated by Christianity, are the authors of the persecutions against Christians."—Some points in this *Apology* are here omitted, because contained in the other summaries.

The shorter *Apology* commences with an account of some persecutions ; which are ascribed to the malice of the demons. It then gives reasons why Christians do not shun martyrdom ; and also, why God permits persecution. "God intrusted the government of the world to angels : these afterwards apostatized from God, and taking human wives, begat the demons ; and by them and their offspring, the human race is now oppressed and ruined. God would before this have destroyed the world, had he not spared it for the sake of the Christians. Yet it is to be destroyed hereafter, and by fire. *Jesus Christ* is superior to *Socrates* ; for no one ever died for the doctrine of the latter. The constancy of Christians under persecution is evidence of their innocence."—These summaries of *Justin's* *Apologies* are specimens of the ground taken by all the ancient Apologists, whose works have come down to us.—Besides the four works now mentioned, *Justin* wrote a book, *de Monarchia Dei*, proving the divine unity in opposition to polytheism, by testimonies from the

did monument of antiquity.(5) *Athenagoras* was no contemptible philosopher; and his *Apology* for the Christians, and his treatise on the resurrection of the body, display both learning and genius.(6) *Theophylus*,

Old Testament and likewise from pagan writers, (Eusebius, H. E., iv. 18). The latter part of the book probably is preserved.—Against the Jews he composed, in the latter part of his life, his *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo*. He defends Christianity against the Jews, chiefly by arguments from the ancient prophecies and types of *Christ* in the Old Testament. He also wrote a book against *Marcion*, and another against all the heresies; both of which are unfortunately lost. So are his book concerning *the soul*, (in which he collected the opinions of the philosophers on that subject), and his book entitled, *Psalmes*. There are several other works now extant under his name, which are either doubted or denied to be his: namely, an *Epistle* to *Diognetus*; and another to *Zenas* and *Serenus*; 146 *Questions* and their solutions, to the Orthodox; *Exposition* of the true Faith (on the Trinity); *Metaphysical Questions* (*Questiones Græcæ*) and answers; *Questions* to the Greeks, and their answers refuted; a confutation of some Aristotelian doctrines, &c. *Justin's* works make a considerable folio volume. They were well edited, Paris, 1636, reprinted Cologne, 1686: but still better in the Benedictine ed., by *Prudent. Maran*, Paris, 1742. *Thirlby's* ed. of the dialogue, Lond., 1722, fol., is good. The two *Apologies*, with those of *Tertullian* and *Minutius Felix*, are given in English by *W. Reeve*, Lond., 1707, 2 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*

(5) [*Irenæus*, who was active during the last half of this century, was born and educated in Asia Minor, under *Polycarp* and *Papias*. About A.D. 150, *Pothinus* and others went from Asia Minor to Lyons and Vienne in France; and *Irenæus*, then a young man, is supposed to have been one of those missionaries. He remained a presbyter till the death of *Pothinus*, A.D. 177, when he succeeded him in the episcopal chair at Lyons, which he filled till about A.D. 202, the time of his martyrdom. While a presbyter he was sent to Rome by his church, concerning the affair of *Montanus*. He is supposed to have composed the letter written in the name of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, giving the graphic account of their persecution in A.D. 177. He likewise took an active part in the controversy respecting Easter, A.D. 196; and wrote to *Victor*, bishop of Rome, on the subject; and also to the presbyter *Blastus*, who was deposed at Rome during that con-

test. *Eusebius* has also preserved part of a letter of his to *Florinus*, an apostate to Gnosticism, with whom *Irenæus* had been intimate in his youth. Some other small works of his are mentioned by the ancients. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., c. 15, 20, 24, 26. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. illustr., cap. 35.—But the great work of *Irenæus* is his *Examination* and *Confutation* of the misnamed (*γνώσις*) knowledge, in v. Books, commonly called *Libri contra Hæreses*. The work is altogether polemic; and is directed particularly against *Valentinus*; yet so as to be a confutation of all the Gnostics, and a defence of the catholic faith against most of the heretics of that age. The book contains much information, respecting the early heretics, their origin, sentiments, and characters; also respecting the state of theological science in that age, the doctrines generally received and taught, and the manner of stating and defending them. But unfortunately, the original Greek is lost, except the extracts preserved by *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, and others; and the Latin translation, which is very ancient, is extremely barbarous, and sometimes scarcely intelligible.—*Irenæus* was an ardent and sincere Christian, and a discreet and amiable man. He possessed considerable learning and influence; but his mind does not appear to have been one of the highest order. As an interpreter of Scripture, like all the early fathers, he was too fond of tracing allegories; and as a theologian, few of the moderns will account him entirely correct in principle, or perfectly conclusive in his reasonings.—See, concerning his life and writings, *Cave*, Du Pin, *Massuet*, (works of *Irenæus*), the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. v., June, p. 335. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 51; and *Milner*, Hist. of the Chh., century iii., ch. i., vol. i., p. 215, ed. Boston, 1822.—The best editions of his works, are, by *Grabe*, Lond., 1702, fol.; and the Benedictine, by *Massuet*, Paris, 1710, and Venice, 1734, 2 tomi, fol.—*Tr.*]

(6) [*Athenagoras*, one of the most elegant and able writers the church has produced, is scarcely mentioned by any of the fathers. *Methodius*, about A.D. 285, quoted from him; (See *Epiph. Hæres.*, 65), *Philip Sides*, about A.D. 400, gives some account of him; (in *Dodwell's* Diss. on *Irenæus*, p. 408), and *Photius*, (*Bibliotheca*), in the ninth century, speaks of him. This is all the fathers tell us. It appears from the title of his apology, that he was a Christian philosopher

bishop of Antioch, has left us three Books, addressed to one Autolycus, in defence of Christianity, which are erudite but not well digested.(7) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, a presbyter and head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, was a man of extensive reading, and especially in the works of ancient authors. This is manifest from the works of his that remain, namely, his *Stromata*, his *Paedagogus*, and *ad Græcos Ehortatio*. But he was infected with very great errors, into which he was betrayed by his excessive love of philosophy: nor are his works to be recommended, as exhibiting good arrangement and perspicuity of style.(8) In the Latin

of Athens; and that he wrote his *Apology* in the reign of the emperors *Marcus* and *Commodus*.—*Philip Sidetes*, who is a writer of little credit, says, he presided in the school at Alexandria, before *Pantaenus*; which is contradicted by *Eusebius*; and that he was converted to Christianity, by reading the Scriptures with a design to confute them; which may be true. *Dr. Mosheim*, in his *Diss. de vera ætate Apologetici Athenag.* (Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles., vol. i., p. 269, &c.), has proved, that the *Apology* was written A.D. 177, the very year of the persecutions at Lyons and Vienne. *Athenagoras* descants on the same topics as *Justin Martyr*, and employs the same arguments; but his composition is immensely superior as to style and method.—His other work, *de Resurrectione*, is written with equal elegance, and contains the arguments used in that age, to support the doctrine of the resurrection of the body against the objections of philosophers.—His works, besides being printed separately by *Edw. Dechair*, Oxford, 1706, 8vo, are commonly subjoined to those of *Justin Martyr*; and the best editions are those of *Grabe*, Lond., 1802, and *Massuet*, Paris, 1710.—*Tr.*]

(7) [*Theophylus* was made bishop of Antioch in Syria, A.D. 168, and died about A.D. 182 or 183. The best accounts of him by the ancients, are those of *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. l. iv., c. 20, 23, and *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 25.—He appears to have been a converted pagan, a man of reading, a decided and active Christian pastor, sound in faith, and zealous for the truth. He is not metaphysical, but still is rather a dry and argumentative writer. He composed a book against *Hermogenes*; and another against *Marcion*; and a Commentary on the four Gospels; all of which are lost. His great work, and the only one which has reached us, is his three Books, addressed to his pagan friend *Autolycus*, in vindication of Christianity. Here he takes much the same ground with *Justin Martyr* and the other Apologists; but he descends more into detail, in his proofs from Scripture and from history. He is fond of allegorical and fanciful interpreta-

tions, and on them rests a large part of his arguments. For example: about the middle of the second book, he makes (*ἐν ἀρχῇ*) in the beginning, Gen. i., 1, to mean, by Christ. The constitution by which vegetables spring up from seeds and roots, was designed to teach the resurrection of our bodies. The dry lands surrounded by seas, denote the church surrounded by enemies. The sun is a type of God; as the moon is of man, that frail, changeable creature. The three days preceding the creation of the sun and moon, (*τρεῖς εἰς τριάδος τῷ Θεῷ*), are typical of the Trinity of God and his Word and his Wisdom. (This is said to be the earliest occurrence of the word *Trinity*, in the writings of the fathers.) The fixed stars, among which the sun moves, indicate righteous and holy men who serve God; and the planets denote heretics and apostates, &c., &c.—Yet the work is not all of this character. It contains much that is instructive and solid; and is written in a plain, familiar style.—*Tr.*]

(8) [*Titus Flavius Clemens*, whether born at Athens or Alexandria, was a pagan in early life, and devoted himself to philosophy. He travelled in Greece, in south Italy, in Cælo-Syria, in Palestine, and lastly in Egypt, where he was a pupil of *Pantaenus* the master of the Christian school at Alexandria. Becoming a Christian, he was made a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and succeeded his preceptor *Pantaenus*, as master of the catechetical or divinity school. He taught with great applause during the reign of *Severus*, (A.D. 193–211), and had *Origen* and other eminent men of the third century, for pupils. About A.D. 202, he retired into Palestine and Syria, for a short time, to avoid persecution. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 220.—*Clement* had vast learning, a lively imagination, great fluency, considerable discrimination, and was a bold and independent speculator. That he had true piety, and held the essential truths of the Gospel, is admitted by all; but no one of the fathers, except *Origen*, has been more censured in modern times, for an excessive attachment to philosophy or metaphysical

language, scarcely any writer of this century elucidated or defended the Christian religion, except *Tertullian*. He was at first a jurisconsult, then a presbyter at Carthage, and at last a follower of *Montanus*. We have various short works of his, which aim either to explain and defend the truth, or to excite piety. Which were the greatest, his excellences or his defects, it is difficult to say. He possessed great genius; but it was wild and unchastened. His piety was active and fervent; but likewise gloomy and austere. He had much learning and knowledge; but lacked discretion and judgment: he was more acute than solid.(9)

theology. He was a true *Eclectic*, which he also professed to be; that is, he followed no master implicitly, but examined and judged for himself. Yet his education and the atmosphere in which he lived, led him to lean towards Platonism and Stoicism. His great error was, that he overrated the value of philosophy or human reason, as a guide in matters of religion. He also indulged his imagination, as all the learned of his age did, to excess; and construed the Bible allegorically, and fancifully.—His three principal works, which have reached us, constitute one whole. His *Exhortatio ad Græcos* was intended to convince and convert pagans. It exposes the nakedness of polytheism, and demonstrates the truth and excellence of Christianity. His *Pædagogus*, in iii. Books, was intended to instruct a young convert in the practice of Christianity. It is an indifferent performance, dwells much on trivial rules of conduct, and does not go to the bottom even of external morality. His *Stromata*, in viii. Books, (the last of which is not the genuine 8th Book), are written without method, or in a most discursive manner. In them *Clement* attempts to give the world his most profound thoughts and speculations on theology, and on the kindred sciences.—He has also left us a practical treatise, entitled *Quis dives ille sit*, qui salvetur; in which his object is to show to what temptations and dangers the *rich* are exposed. There are ascribed to him, and printed with his works, Extracts from the writings of *Theodotus* and the Oriental philosophy, (the contents of some one's note-book, respecting the Gnostics); and Selections from the Prophets, (of no great value), which may have been taken from the loose papers of *Clement*, yet are dubious.—*Eusebius* and *Jerome* mention works of his, which are now lost. Of these the principal, are libri viii. Hypotyposeon, a compendious exposition of the O. and N. Testament. The others were tracts; de Paschate, de Jejuniis, de Obtrectatione, Exhortatio ad Patientiam, and Canon Ecclesiasticus, or de Canonibus Ecclesiasticis.—The character and writings of *Clement*, have been elaborately investigated

by various persons, among whom are *N. le Nourry* (Apparat. ad Biblioth. Patr.); *J. G. Walch* (Miscellanea Sacra); *J. Brucker*, (Hist. crit. philos.); and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i.—The best edition of his works, is that of *Potter*, Oxon., 1715, fol. —Tr.]

(9) Those who wish further information concerning these writers, their defects, and their works, are directed,—and the direction is given once for all,—to consult those authors, who treat professedly of the Ecclesiastical Writers; namely, *J. A. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Græca, and Biblioth. Latina. *W. Cave*, Historia Litteraria Scriptor. Eccles. *L. Ellics du Pin* and *Remigius Cellerier*, in their Bibliothecas of Eccles. Writers in French; and others.

[*Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus* was the son of a pagan centurion of proconsular rank, and born at Carthage about A.D. 160. He was bred to the law; but becoming a Christian, was made a presbyter in the church of Carthage, where he appears to have spent his whole life. About A.D. 200, he embraced the sentiments of the Montanists; which he afterwards defended with his usual ardour. He is said to have lived to a great age; and yet he is supposed to have died about A.D. 220.—*Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 53. *Eusebius*, Chronicon. ann. 16 Severi, and others, give him a high character. *Jerome* tells us, that *Cyprian*, bp. of Carthage, was accustomed to read some portions of his works daily; and in calling for this author, used to say: Da magistrum, bring my master. He wrote with great force, and displayed much both of erudition and acuteness; but his style is concise, harsh, and extremely difficult for modern readers. His diction and his spirit too, it has been supposed, were extensively propagated in the Latin church.—His works consist of about 30 short treatises, and are nearly all of a polemic cast, argumentative, vituperative, and severe. They may be divided into three classes; namely, *apologetic*, or in controversy with pagans and Jews;—*doctrinal*, or confutations of heretics;—and *moral*, in defence or confutation of certain practices

or rules of conduct.—Of the first class are his *Apologeticum*, and *ad Nationes Libri ii.* These are only different editions of the same work; and were composed about A.D. 198:—*de Testimonio anime*; the testimony of conscience or common sense to the truths maintained by Christians:—*ad Scapulam*, a pagan magistrate; an expostulation with him, (A.D. 211):—*adversus Judæos*; proving from the O. T. that *Jesus* was the Messiah, and Christianity true.—In all these, he takes the same ground with *Justin Martyr* and the other apologists of that age.—Of the second or doctrinal class, are: *de Baptismo*; against one *Quintilla*, who rejected baptism altogether: *de Præscriptionibus hæreticorum*; a confutation of all heresies collectively, on general principles. *Libri v. adv. Marcionem*, (A.D. 207), and single books against the *Valentinians*, *Praxeas* and *Hermogenes*:—*Scorpiace*, or *Scorpiacum*, *adv. Gnosticos*, or *de bono martyrii*; that is, an Antidote against the Scorpions, i. e., the Gnostics, who have no martyrs among them: *de Carne Christi*; that *Christ* truly died on the cross; maintained against the Docetæ: *de Resurrectione*; of the same tenour with the last: *de Anima*; against the philosophers; their notions of the soul confuted.—In attacking the heretics, he takes much the same ground with *Irenæus*.—Most of his works of the third class, were written after he became a Montanist, and are in defence of the rigid principles of that sect, or in opposition to the opinions and practice of Christians in general. The two first, however, were written in his early life, and are of a different character: viz., *de Oratione*; on prayer in general, and the Lord's prayer in particular: *Liber ad Martyres*; designed to comfort and animate them in their dying moments: *de Spectaculis*, and *de Idololatria*; warnings to Christians against attending theatres, and other idolatrous rites: *Libri ii. ad uxorem*; warning her against a second marriage, if she should become a widow; and especially against marrying a pagan:—*de Penitentia*; on penance and humiliation for sin: *de Patientia*.—All the preceding of this class, were probably written before he became an avowed Montanist:—*de corona militis*; justifying and commending a soldier who refused a military crown, and was punished for it:—*de velandis virginibus*; against the custom of the young ladies appearing abroad unveiled:—*de habitu muliebrî*; reprehension of the ladies for their attention to dress: *de Cultu feminarum*; much the same; on their adorning their persons:—*de Fuga in persecutione*; that no one should retire for safety in time of persecution: *Exhortatio*

Castitatis, and *de Monogamia*; two tracts on the same subject; namely, the criminality of second marriages: *de Jejunii adv. Psychicos*; against the orthodox, in defence of the Montanist principles about fasting: *de Pudicitia*; that offenders, especially by unchastity, should never be restored to communion in the church: *de Pallio*; against wearing the Roman toga, and recommending in place of it, the Grecian pallium or cloak.—These are all the works of *Tertullian*, which have reached us. Among his lost works, were seven Books in defence of the Montanists; one on the Believer's hope; one on Paradise, and one on Aaron's garments. The best editions of his works, are, by *Rigaltius*, Paris, 1634, and 1641, fol.; and by *Semler*, Halle, 1769-73, 5 vols. 8vo, with a 6th vol. by *Windorf*, containing indices and a glossary, 1776.

Besides the writers above mentioned, whose works have been preserved, there were many others in this century, of whose works we have only extracts preserved by the fathers. Of these, a catalogue embracing such as are mentioned by *Eusebius* in his *Eccles. History*, and by *Jerome*, *de Scriptoris Illustribus*, is here subjoined.

Papias, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, contemporary with *Ignatius*, in the beginning of the century. He wrote five Books, containing traditional accounts of *Christ*, his apostles, and others of the primitive times. He is said to have advocated the doctrine of the Millennium. *Euseb.*, iii. 39. *Jerome*, c. 18. *Quadratus*, bp. of Athens. He wrote an Apology for the Christians, presented to the Emperor *Adrian*, A.D. 123 or 131. *Euseb.*, iv., 3. *Jerome*, c. 19.

Aristides, an eloquent Christian philosopher of Athens, at the same time presented an Apology. *Euseb.*, iv., 3. *Jerome*, c. 20.

Agrippa Castor, contemporary with the two last. He was "a very learned man;" and wrote a confutation of the 24 Books of *Basildes* the heretic. *Euseb.*, iv., 7. *Jerome*, c. 21.

Hegesippus, a converted Jew, who resided at Corinth and at Rome. He wrote about A.D. 160, five Books of *Eccles. Memoires*, from the crucifixion of *Christ* to his own times. *Euseb.*, iv., 8, 22, and iii., 19, 20, 32. *Jerome*, c. 22.

Melito, bp. of Sardis. He wrote an Apology, besides various short works; namely, *de Pascha* (the time of Easter); *de Vita Prophetarum*; *de Ecclesia*; *de Die Dominica*; *de Sensibus*; *de Fide*; *de Plasmate*; *de Anima et Corpore*; *de Baptismate*; *de Veritate*; *de Generatione Christi*; *de Prophetia*; *de Philoxenia*; a book entitled *Clavis*; *de Diabolo*, *de Apocalypse Joannis*, *de*

Corporali Deo. *Euseb.*, iv., 26. *Jerome*, c. 24.

Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia, A.D. 170. He wrote an Apology; five books against the pagans; *de Veritate*, libri ii.; *adv. Cataphrygas*; *adv. Judaeos*, libri ii. *Euseb.*, iv., 27. *Jerome*, c. 16.

Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, from about A.D. 170. He was an active and influential man, and wrote valuable epistles to several churches and their bishops; namely, to the churches of Sparta, Athens, Nicomedia, Gortyna and others in Crete, Amastris and others in Pontus; and to *Pinitus*, a Cretan bp., and *Victor*, bp. of Rome. *Euseb.*, iv., 23. *Jerome*, c. 27.

Tatian, a rhetorician, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*. After the death of *Justin*, he swerved from the common path, and became founder of a rigorous sect called Encratites. He flourished about A.D. 170, and wrote an Apology, under the title of *Oratio contra Græcos*, which is still extant and usually printed with the works of *Justin Martyr*. He is said to have composed many other works; among which a *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the four Gospels, and a treatise on Perfection after the pattern of *Christ*, are particularly mentioned. *Eusebius*, iv., 29. *Jerome*, c. 29. *Clem. Alex.*, *Strom.* iii., 12.

Musanius, of the same age, wrote against the Encratites. *Jerome*, c. 31. *Eusebius*, iv., 28.

Modestus, of the same age, wrote a book against *Marcion*, which *Eusebius* says exceeded all other confutations of that heretic. *Eusebius*, iv., 25. *Jerome*, c. 32.

Bardesanes, a Syrian of Edessa, of the same age, an eloquent and acute reasoner. He was first a Valentinian; but afterwards, wrote against that and other sects. His works were numerous, which his admirers translated from Syriac into Greek. His dialogues against *Marcion*, and his treatise on Fate, are particularly commended.—*Eusebius*, iv., 30. *Jerome*, c. 33.

Victor, bp. of Rome, A.D. 194–203. His zeal respecting the right day for Easter, led him to write several epistles on that subject. *Eusebius*, v., 24. *Jerome*, c. 34. Nothing of his remains; though two spurious epistles with his name, are still extant.

Pantænus, a Christian philosopher of Alexandria, and head of the Catechetical school there, before *Clement*. He was a learned and active Christian; and wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but none of his works remain. He visited India, or Arabia Felix, as a missionary, and had vast influence in the church. *Euseb.*, v., 10. *Jerome*, c. 36.

Rhodon, an Asiatic Greek, but educated at Rome under *Tatian*. He wrote much; and in particular, on the *Hexaëmeron*, (the six days of creation); a treatise against *Marcion*; and another against the Phrygians or Cataphrygians, the disciples of *Montanus*. *Euseb.*, v., 13. *Jerome*, c. 37.

Miltiades, who flourished in the reign of *Commodus*, A.D. 180–192. He wrote an Apology; a work against the Cataphrygians; two books against the pagans; and two others against the Jews. *Euseb.*, v., 17. *Jerome*, c. 39.

Apollonius, an eloquent Greek writer, author of a long and much valued confutation of the Cataphrygians. *Euseb.*, v., 18. *Jerome*, c. 40.

Scrapion, ordained bp. of Antioch A.D. 191. He wrote an epistle concerning the Montanists or Cataphrygians; another to *Domninus*, an apostate to Judaism; and a tract concerning the spurious Gospel ascribed to *Peter*. *Eusebius*, vi., 12. *Jerome*, c. 41.

Apollonius, a Roman senator and martyr under *Commodus*. His eloquent defence at his trial, was committed to writing. *Eusebius*, v., 21. *Jerome*, c. 42.

Under the reigns of *Commodus* and *Severus*, or A.D. 180–211, lived several writers, mentioned summarily by *Eusebius*, v., 27, and by *Jerome*, c. 46–51: namely, *Heraclitus*, author of a Commentary on Paul's Epistles; *Maximus*, who wrote on the Origin of Evil and the Creation of Matter; *Candidus* and *Appion*, who wrote on the *Hexaëmeron*, (Gen., ch. i.); *Sextus* wrote on the resurrection; and *Arabianus* composed some doctrinal tracts.

All the preceding wrote in Greek, except *Bardesanes*, who composed in Syriac, and *Victor* and *Apollonius* the martyr, who wrote in Latin.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Religion yet Simple.—§ 2. Was gradually Changed.—§ 3. This proved by an Example.—§ 4. Attention to the Scriptures.—§ 5. Faults of Interpreters.—§ 6. State of Dogmatic Theology.—§ 7. Polemics of this Age.—§ 8. Excellences and Defects of the Controversialists.—§ 9. Writers on Practical Religion.—§ 10. Merits of the Fathers in regard to Practical Religion.—§ 11. Twofold System of Practical Religion.—§ 12. Hence the Ascetics.—§ 13. Causes of their Rise.—§ 14. Their Progress.—§ 15. Origin of pious Frauds.—§ 16. Lives of Christians, and the Discipline of Offenders.—§ 17. Public Penitence modelled according to the Rules of the Pagan Mysteries.

§ 1. THE whole Christian system was still comprised in a few precepts and propositions; nor did the teachers publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the *Apostles' creed*. In their manner of handling these doctrines, there was nothing subtle, profound, or distant from common apprehension. This will not appear strange, if we reflect that no controversy had yet been moved, respecting those important points of religion about which contests afterwards arose, and that the bishops were generally plain, unlearned men, more distinguished for their piety than for their genius and eloquence.

§ 2. Yet from this venerable simplicity, insensibly, there was a considerable departure; many points were more critically investigated, and more artificially stated; many principles also were imprudently adopted, which were derived from philosophy, and that too not of the most solid character. This change arose from two principal causes. The first lay in the disposition of certain teachers, who wished to make Christianity appear in harmony with the decisions of philosophy, and who thought it elegant to state Christian precepts in the language of philosophers, jurists, and rabbis. The other cause is found in the discussions with the opposers and corrupters of the truth. To meet these, the Christian doctors were sometimes under a necessity to state with precision what was before undefined, and to exhibit their views with more discrimination.

§ 3. Whoever wishes for an example, need only consider what began to be taught in this age respecting the state of souls when separated from the body. *Jesus* and his apostles simply taught, that the spirits of holy men on leaving the body were received to heaven; and that those of the wicked went to hell. And this satisfied the first disciples of *Christ*, in whom there was more piety than curiosity. But this plain doctrine was materially injured, when Christians were induced to agree with the Platonics and others, that only the souls of heroes and men of distinguished abilities were raised to heaven; while those of others, being weighed down by their sensual propensities, sunk to the infernal regions, and could never attain to the world of light till cleansed from their pollutions.(1) From the time that this opinion began to prevail, the *martyrs* only were repre-

(1) I have treated largely of these senti- Platonics, in my notes on *R. Cudworth's* ments of the ancients, and especially of the Intellectual System, tom. ii., p. 1036.

sented and believed to be happy immediately after death ; and others were assigned to some obscure region, in which they were detained till the second coming of *Christ*, or at least, till their impurities which disqualified them for heaven should be removed from them. From this source, how numerous and how vast the errors ?—what vain ceremonies ?—what monstrous superstitions took their rise ?

§ 4. But they all revered the holy scriptures, as the rule of faith and the standard of truth ; and therefore they wished them to be in the hands of all. Of the translations of the scriptures into other languages, we have already spoken. We shall here speak only of the expositors. The first Christian who composed explanations of the sacred volume, if I mistake not, was *Pantænus*, the master of the Alexandrine school. But divine providence has so ordered, that none of his writings have reached us. The *Hypotyposes* also, of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in which he is said to have expounded detached passages from all the sacred books, have been lost ; and likewise his *Commentaries on the canonical Epistles*. *Tatian* composed a *Harmony of the Gospels*, which has [not] escaped the ravages of time.(2) *Justin Martyr* explained the *Apocalypse* ; *Theophilus* of Antioch elucidated the *four Gospels* ; and [several] others expounded the Mosaic account of the creation. All these works are now lost.

§ 5. But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of scripture to contain *two meanings*, the one *obvious* and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other *recondite* and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell ; and neglecting the former, as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter ; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning. Some also, and this is stated especially of *Clement*, attempted to make the divine oracles teach and support the precepts of philosophy. The excessive and almost divine authority ascribed to the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint, was a great obstacle to any valuable and suitable interpretation of that part of the Bible.

§ 6. A system of Christian theology, so far as we can learn, was composed by no one in this age. The tracts of *Arabianus*, (de dogmate Christiano), having been all lost, we cannot tell what they were. The five Books of *Papias*, (de Dictis Christi et Apostolorum, or, Explanatio oraculorum dominicorum), so far as can be learned from *Eusebius*,(3) must be regarded rather as a historical than a doctrinal work. *Melito* of Sardis is said to have written, de Fide, de Creatione, de Ecclesia, and de Veritate : but it does not appear from these titles, whether they were polemic or doctrinal treatises. Some points in theology were stated and defended, by those who engaged in religious controversies. But the doc-

(2) [I cannot but think there must be a great typographical error in the original of this sentence. For it is not easy to believe, that *Dr. Mosheim* held to the long exploded notion, that either of those Harmonies of the four Gospels, which we have in the Bibliotheca Patrum, could be the genuine work of *Tatian*. See *Prudentius Maran*, Diss. xiii,

cap. xii., § 5, 6, prefixed to his edition of *Justin Martyr*, &c., and republished by *Sprenger*, Thesaurus Rei Patristicæ, tom. ii.—Tr.]

(3) [*Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 29. See also *Irenæus*, adv. Hæres., l. v., c. 33. *Jerome*, de Scriptoribus Illustr., cap. 18.—Tr.]

trines which were not brought into controversy, were for the most part not so distinctly treated by the writers of that age, as to enable us fully to understand what their views were. It is therefore not strange, that all sects of Christians can find in what are called the *Fathers*, something to favour their own opinions and systems.

§ 7. The controversial writers who distinguished themselves in this century, encountered either the *Jews*, or the *worshippers of idol gods*, or the corrupters of the Christian doctrine and the founders of new sects, that is, the *heretics*. With the *Jews*, contended in particular *Justin Martyr*, in his dialogue with Trypho; and likewise *Tertullian*; but neither of them, in the best manner; because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject. The *pagans* were assailed by those especially, who wrote *Apologies* for the Christians; as *Athenagoras*, *Melito*, *Quadratus*, *Miltiades*, *Aristides*, *Tatian*, and *Justin Martyr*; or who composed *Addresses to the pagans*; as *Justin*, *Tertullian*, *Clement*, and *Theophilus* of Antioch. All these vanquished paganism, and answered the calumnies cast upon the Christians, solidly and dexterously; but they were less able and successful in explaining the nature of the Christian religion, and in demonstrating its truth and divine origin. At least, we perceive that much is wanting in the explanations they give of Christian doctrines, and in the arguments they use in confirmation of religious truth. Those who chastised the *heretics*, make a numerous body; but we have few of their writings left. The whole host of *heretics* were attacked by *Irenæus* in a work expressly against them; by *Clement* in his *Stromata*; and by *Tertullian*, de *Præscriptionibus adversus hæreticos*; not to mention *Justin Martyr*, whose confutation of them has been lost. Those who wrote against particular sects of heretics, it would be tedious to enumerate; besides, the works of most of them are not preserved.

§ 8. In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry and the dishonourable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as are suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding. One, laying aside the divine scriptures, from which all the weapons of religious controversy should be drawn, bids us consult the bishops of those churches which were founded by apostles. Another, as if contending about the title or the boundaries of lands in a court of law, with an ill grace pleads *prescription* against his adversaries. A third initiates the silly disputants among the *Jews*, who offered as arguments the mystic powers of numbers and words.(4) Nor are those wholly in error, who think that the vicious mode of disputing which afterwards obtained the name of *æconomical*, was sometimes used even in this century.(5)

(4) Examples may be seen in *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire des Juifs*, tome iii., p. 660, 694.

(5) *R. Simon*, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.*, cap. ii., p.

21. [*To do, or to say anything*, κατ' ὁικονομίαν, or ὁικονομικῶς, is to use *deception* or *good policy*, rather than fair honest dealing; yet with good intentions, or for a good end. See *Suicer*, *Thesaur. Ecclesiast.*, tom.

§ 9. The principal parts of practical religion or morality, are treated of by *Justin Martyr*, or whoever it was that composed the *Epistle to Zenas and Serenus*, found among the works of Justin. Others took up particular duties in set treatises. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* composed tracts on *Calumny*, *Patience*, *Contenance*, and other virtues; which have not escaped the ravages of time. But the tracts of *Tertullian* on practical duties, namely, on *Chastity*, on *Flight from Persecution*, on *Fasting*, on *Theatrical Exhibitions*, on the *Dress of Females*, on *Prayer*, &c., have come safely to our hands; and would be perused with greater profit, were it not for the gloomy and morose spirit which they everywhere breathe, and the excessively artificial and difficult style in which they are written.

§ 10. In what estimation these and other ancient writers on Christian morals ought to be held, the learned are not agreed. Some hold them to be the very best guides to true piety and a holy life; others, on the contrary, think their precepts were the worst possible, and that the cause of practical religion could not be committed to worse hands. (6) Competent judges will decide the question for themselves. To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; but also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Stoic and Academic philosophy; many things vague and indeterminate; and many things positively false, and inconsistent with the precepts of *Christ*. If one deserves the title of a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of Christian duties, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting Christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders in expounding the divine laws; though he may say many excellent things, and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth, this title belongs to many of the *Fathers*.

§ 11. In this century there was admitted, with good intentions no doubt, yet most inconsiderately, a great error in regard to morals, and pernicious to Christianity; an error, which through all succeeding ages to our times, has produced an infinity of mistakes and evils of various kinds. *Jesus* our Saviour, prescribed one and the same rule of life or duty to all his disci-

ii., p. 459. See also note 11, cent. iii., pt. ii., ch. iii.—*Tr.*]

(6) On this subject in our day, the learned and ingenious *Jo. Barbeyrac* held a controversy with *Remigius Cellier*, a Benedictine monk. A history of the controversy, with his own opinion of it, is given by *J. P. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii., cap. iv., § iv., p. 553, &c. Afterwards *Barbeyrac* published a more full defence of the severe judgment he had passed upon the fathers, under the title of *Traité de la Morale des Pères*, Amsterdam, 1723, 4to, which is well worth reading by those who wish to investigate the subject; yet I think, he charges the fathers with some faults, which may easily be excused. [*Liberatus Fassonius*, a Catholic, published an answer to *Barbeyrac*, in a Latin work, *de morali Patrum doctrina*, adv.

Librum Jo. Barbeyraci, Liburni, 1767, 4to. *Fassonius* excuses the fathers for the following opinions, charged upon them as errors by *Barbeyrac*; namely, that they condemned taking interest for money loaned; placed too high a value on virginity, and accounted celibacy a more holy state than matrimony; forbid husbands sleeping with their wives while pregnant; deemed it unsuitable for clergymen to marry, and excluded from the ministry such as married a second time;—commended a monastic life; made two systems of duty, one for the more perfect, and another for common Christians;—and held it lawful to persecute heretics with fire and sword. Most of the other faults charged on the fathers by *Barbeyrac*, *Fassonius* maintains, should be charged solely on the heretics.—*Tr.*]

ples. But the Christian doctors, either by too great a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or from a natural propensity to austerity and gloom, (a disease that many labour under in Syria, Egypt, and other provinces of the East), were induced to maintain that *Christ* had prescribed a *twofold rule of holiness and virtue*; the one ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one lower, the other higher; the one for men of business, the other for persons of leisure, and such as desired higher glory in the future world. They therefore early divided all that had been taught them either in books or by tradition, respecting a Christian life and morals, into *Precepts* and *Counsels*. They gave the name of *Precepts* to those laws which were universally obligatory, or were enacted for all men of all descriptions; but the *Counsels* pertained solely to those who aspire after superior holiness and a closer union with God.

§ 12. There soon arose therefore a class of persons, who professed to strive after that extraordinary and more eminent holiness, and who of course resolved to obey the *Counsels* of *Christ*, that they might have intimate communion with God in this life, and might, on leaving the body, rise without impediment or difficulty to the celestial world. They supposed many things were forbidden to *them*, which were allowed to other Christians; such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and worldly business.(7) They thought they must emaciate their bodies with watching, fasting, toil, and hunger. They considered it a blessed thing to retire to desert places, and by severe meditation to abstract their minds from all external objects and whatever delights the senses. Both men and women imposed these severe restraints on themselves, with good intentions, I suppose, but setting a bad example, and greatly to the injury of the cause of Christianity. They were of course denominated *Ascetics*, Σπρδαῖοι, Ἐκλεκτοί, and also *philosophers*; and they were distinguished from other Christians, not only by a different appellation, but by peculiarities of dress and demeanour.(8) Those who in this century embraced this austere mode of life, lived indeed only for themselves, but they did not withdraw themselves altogether from the society and converse of men. But in process of time, persons of this description at first retired into deserts, and afterwards formed themselves into associations, after the manner of the *Essenes* and *Therapeutae*.

§ 13. The causes of this institution are at hand. First, the Christians did not like to appear inferior to the Greeks, the Romans, and the other people; among whom there were many philosophers and sages, who were distinguished from the vulgar by their dress and their whole mode of life, and who were held in high honour. Now among these philosophers, (as is well known), none better pleased the Christians than the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans*; who are known to have recommended *two* modes of living, the one for philosophers who wished to excel others in virtue, and the other for people engaged in the common affairs of life.(9) The *Platonists* prescribed the following rule for philosophers: The mind of a wise

(7) *Athenagoras*, Apologia pro Christianis, cap. 28, p. 129, ed. Oxon., and others.

(8) See *C. Salmasius*, Comment. in Tertullian. de Pallio, p. 7, 8, [Sam. Dryling, Exercit. de Ascetis Vet. in Observ. Sacr., l. iii., and *Jos. Bingham*, Antiq. Eccles., vol. iii., p. 3, &c.—Schl.]

(9) They made a distinction between living according to nature, ζῆν κατὰ φύσιν, and living above nature, ζῆν ὑπὲρ φύσιν. See *Aeneas Gazæus*, in Theophrasto, p. 29, ed. Barthii. The former was the rule for all men; the latter, only for philosophers who aimed at perfect virtue.

man must be withdrawn, as far as possible, from the contagious influence of the body. And as the oppressive load of the body and social intercourse are most adverse to this design, therefore all sensual gratifications are to be avoided; the body is to be sustained, or rather mortified, with coarse and slender fare; solitude is to be sought for; and the mind is to be self-collected, and absorbed in contemplation, so as to be detached as much as possible from the body.(10) Whoever lives in this manner, shall in the present life have converse with God; and, when freed from the load of the body, shall ascend without delay to the celestial mansions, and shall not need, like the souls of other men, to undergo a purgation. The grounds of this system lay in the peculiar sentiments entertained by this sect of philosophers and by their friends, respecting the *soul*, *demons*, *matter*, and the *universe*. And as these sentiments were embraced by the Christian philosophers, the necessary consequences of them were of course to be adopted also.

§ 14. What is here stated will excite less surprise, if it be remembered, that *Egypt* was the land where this mode of life had its origin. For that country, from some law of nature, has always produced a greater number of gloomy and hypochondriac or melancholy persons than any other;(11) and it still does so. Here it was that long before the Saviour's birth, not only the *Essenes* and *Therapeutae*,—those Jewish sects, composed of persons affected with a morbid melancholy, or rather partially deranged,—had their chief residence; but many others also, that they might better please the gods, withdrew themselves as by the instinct of nature from commerce with men and from all the pleasures of life.(12) From Egypt, this mode of life passed into Syria and the neighbouring countries, which in like manner always abounded with unsociable and austere individuals:(13) and from the East it was at last introduced among the nations of Europe. Hence the numerous maladies which still deform the Christian world; hence the celibacy of the clergy; hence the numerous herds of monks; hence the two species of life, the *theoretical* and *mystical*; hence the many other things of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of our work.

§ 15. To this great error of the Christians may be added another, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one and productive of many evils. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie, for the sake of truth and piety.(14) The Jews living in Egypt, learned from them this sentiment before the Christian era, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread among the Christians. Of this no one will doubt, who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses,(15)

(10) Consult here, by all means, that most distinguished Platonist, *Porphyry*, *περὶ ἀποχῆς*, or, *on Abstinence from flesh*, lib. i., § 27 and 41, p. 22, 34, where he formally lays down rules for these duties of a philosopher.

(11) See *Bened. Maillet*, *Description de l'Egypte*, tome ii., p. 57, &c., Paris, 1735, 4to.

(12) *Herodotus*, *Historiar.*, l. ii., p. 104, ed. Gronov. *Epiphanius*, *Expos. fidei*, § 11, Opp., tom. ii., p. 1092. *Tertullian*, de

Exhortatione castitatis, cap. 13. *Athanasius*, *Vita Antonii*, Opp., tom. ii., p. 453.

(13) *Jo. Chardin*, *Voyages in Perse*, tome iv., p. 197, ed. Amsterd., 1735, 4to.

(14) [*Mosheim*, on this subject, in his *Comment. de Reb. Christ.*, &c., p. 231, refers us to his *Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicas ecclesias*, § 41, &c.—*Tr.*]

(15) [Concerning the Sibylline verses, which were composed about A.D. 138, *J. A. Fabricius* has treated largely, *Biblioth.*

and other similar trash,(16) a large mass of which appeared in this and the following centuries. I would not say that the orthodox Christians forged all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the *Gnostic* sects. Yet that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.

§ 16. The more the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the greater the number of vicious and bad men who thrust themselves into it; as may be proved by the many complaints and censures of the writers of this age. The well-known custom of excluding transgressors from the communion, was a barrier against the more flagrant and notorious crimes. Of all sins, those accounted the most heinous and the greatest, were these three, *murder, idolatry, and adultery*; which terms, however, must here be understood in the broadest sense. Those guilty of these crimes, were in many churches cut off for ever from communion; in other churches, they were received back after a long, severe, and painful probation.(17)

§ 17. It is worthy of particular notice, that this custom of excluding bad characters from the society of Christians, and of not receiving them back except upon full proof of reformation, was at first a simple process, or attended with very little formality; but by degrees, the regulations for it were greatly amplified and deformed by many rites borrowed especially from the discipline of the pagan mysteries.(18) That it was proper for the Christian bishops to increase the restraints upon the licentiousness of transgression, will be readily granted by all who consider the circumstances of those times. But whether it was for the advantage of Christianity, to borrow rules for this salutary ordinance from the enemies of the truth, and thus to consecrate, as it were, a part of the pagan superstition, many per-

Græca, tom. i. The latest editor of the verses, is *Serrat. Gallæus*, who has corrected the text, and added copious notes, Amsterd., 1689, 4to. He has subjoined the Magic Oracles ascribed to *Zoroaster* and others; in which are many things of Christian origin. That the Sibylline verses were fabricated by some Christian, in order to bring idolaters to believe in the truth of Christianity, has been well shown by *Dav. Blondell*, among others; and with a very few exceptions, there is no learned man at the present day, who thinks otherwise. *Blondell's* work which is in French, was first published under the title: *Des Sibylles célébrées tant par l'Antiquité payenne, que par les saints Pères*, Charenton, 1649, 4to. Two years after, the title was changed; doubtless to allure purchasers; *Traite de la Creance des Pères touchant l'Etat des ames apres cette vie, &c.*, à l'occasion de l'Écrit attribue aux Sibelles, Charenton, 1651, 4to. —That the pagans were indignant at this forgery, which they attributed to the Christians, appears from *Origen*, contra Celsum, lib. v., p. 272, ed Spencer; *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinor., l. iv., c. 14; and *Constantine the Great*, Oratio ad Sanctos, in *Euseb.*,

Hist. Eccles. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 230. See also the references in *Gieseler's* Text-book, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 99, note 4. — *Tr.*

(16) [That the books now circulated under the name of *Hermes*, and particularly the one called *Parmander*, were a Christian forgery, was first shown by *Is. Cusaubon*, Exercit. 1, in *Baronium*, § 18, p. 54, and afterwards by *H. Conringius*, *Beausobre*, *Cudworth*, *Warburton*, and many others. Some however, suppose the books were originally composed by Platonists; and afterwards interpolated and corrupted by some Christian. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., p. 230. — *Tr.*]

(17) In this manner I think, we may reconcile the different opinions of learned men on this subject. See *Jo. Morin*, de Disciplina pœnitentiæ, lib. ix., cap. 19, p. 670, &c. *Jo. Sirmoud*, Historia pœnitentiæ publicæ, cap. i., Opp., tom. iv., p. 323, and the recent Dissertation of *Jo. Aug. Orsi*, de Criminum capitalium per tria priora sæcula absolute, Mediolani, 1730, 4to.

(18) See *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliographiæ Antiquariæ, p. 397. *Jo. Morin*, de Pœnitentia, lib. i., cap. 15, 16, &c.

sons very justly call in question. The more candid will appreciate the good *intention* of those who introduced this sort of rules and ceremonies; all beyond this they will ascribe to human weakness.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Ceremonies much Increased.—§ 2. Reasons; I. Desire to enlarge the Church.—§ 3. II. Hope that they would silence Calumnies.—§ 4. III. Abuse of Jewish Terms.—§ 5. IV. Imitation of the Pagan Mysteries.—§ 6. V. Mode of Instructing by Symbols.—§ 7. VI. Habits of the Converts.—§ 8. The Assemblies for Worship.—§ 9. Contests about the Time for Easter.—§ 10. Their Importance.—§ 11. The Asiatics and the Romans, the principal Parties.—§ 12. Celebration of the Lord's Supper.—§ 13. Baptism.

§ 1. IT is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity and to the great offence of sober and good men.(1) The principal cause of this, I readily look for in the perverseness of mankind, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external forms and pageantry, than with the true devotion of the heart, and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears.(2) But other and additional causes may be mentioned, which, though they suppose no bad design, yet clearly betray indiscretion.

§ 2. *First*, there is good reason to suppose that the Christian bishops purposely multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and the pagans more friendly to them. For both these classes had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and had made no question of their constituting an essential part of religion. And hence, when they saw the new religion to be destitute of such ceremonies, they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it. To obviate this objection, the rulers of the Christian churches deemed it proper for them to be more formal and splendid in their public worship.(3)

(1) *Tertullian*, Liber de creatione, Opp., p. 792, &c.

(2) [To illustrate the influence of splendid ceremonies on mankind, Dr. *Maclaine* here states; that, "The late Lord *Bolingbroke*, being present at the elevation of the host in the Cathedral at Paris, expressed to a nobleman who stood near him, his surprise that the *king* of France should commit the performance of such an august and striking ceremony to any subject."—*Tr.*]

(3) It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here, a very apposite passage, which I accidentally met with, in *Gregory Nyssen's* life of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in the Works of *Thaumaturgus*, as published by *Vossius*, p. 312, who gives the Latin only: Cum animadvertisset, (*Gregorius*), quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates simplex et impe-

ritum vulgus in simulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permisit eis, ut in memoriam ac recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent et in letitiam effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurum esset, ut sua sponte ad honestiorem et accuratorem vitæ rationem transirent.—When *Gregory* perceived, that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensitive pleasures and delights it afforded—he allowed them in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure, (i. e., as the thing itself, and both what precedes and what follows, place beyond all controversy, he allowed them at the sepulchres of the martyrs on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all things that the worshippers of

§ 3. *Secondly*, the simplicity of the worship which Christians offered to the Deity, had given occasion to certain calumnies, maintained both by the Jews and the pagan priests. The Christians were pronounced *Atheists*, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp, in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought they must introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of people; so that they could maintain that they really *had* all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms.

§ 4. *Thirdly*, it is well known, that in the books of the New Testament, various parts of the Christian religion are expressed in terms borrowed from the Jewish laws, or are represented as in some measure parallel with the Mosaic rites. This language, the Christian doctors and writers not only imitated, but extended still farther; and in this there was little to censure. But in process of time, either from inconsideration or from ignorance, or from motives of policy, the majority decided that such phraseology was not figurative, but accordant with the nature of the things, and to be understood in its proper sense. The bishops were at first innocently called *high priests*, and the presbyters, *priests*, and the deacons, *Levites*. But in a little time, those to whom these titles were given abused them; and maintained that they had the same rank and dignity, and possessed the same rights and privileges with those who bore these titles under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the origin of *first fruits*, and next of *tithes*; hence the *splendid garments*, and many other things. In like manner, the comparison of the Christian *oblations* with the Jewish *victims* and *sacrifices*, produced many unnecessary rites; and in time corrupted essentially the doctrine of the *Lord's supper*, which, ere they were aware of it, was converted into a *sacrifice*.

§ 5. *Fourthly*, among the Greeks and the people of the East nothing was held more sacred than what were called the *Mysteries*. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say, that *they* also had similar *mysteries*, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's supper; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms. (4) This practice originated in the eastern provinces; and thence, after the times of *Adrian*, (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins), (5) it spread among the Christians of the West. A

idols were accustomed to do in their temples, on their festival days), hoping, that in process of time, they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life.

(4) Examples are given by *Is. Casaubon*, Exercit. xvi., in *Annales Baronii*, p. 388. *Ja. Tollius*, *Insignibus itineris Italici*, notes p. 151, 163. *Ez. Spanheim*, Notes to his French translation of *Julian's* *Cæsars*, p. 133, 134. *Dav. Clarkson*, *Discourse on Liturgies*, p. 36, 42, 43, and others.

(5) *Spartianus*, *Hadrian*, c. 13, p. 15,

ed. Obrechtii. [*Spartian* speaks only of the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, into which *Adrian* was initiated at Athens. These, it may be, that *Adrian* first introduced among the Latins; yet he was not the first Roman initiated in them.—That some *Mysteries* had before this time, been introduced into the Roman worship, appears from the Epistles of *Cicero* to *Atticus*, l. v., 21, end; lib. vi., l. end; l. xv., 25. *Gronovius* indeed understands these (*mysteria Romana*) to be the worship of the goddess *Bona Dea*. See his *Observ.*, l. iv., c. 9. But on this worship, no male

large part therefore of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries.

§ 6. *Fifthly*, many ceremonies took their rise from the custom of the Egyptians and of almost all the eastern nations, of conveying instruction by *images*, *actions*, and sensible *signs* and emblems. The Christian doctors, therefore, thought it would be advantageous to the cause of Christianity to place the truths which are necessary to be known in order to salvation, as it were *before the eyes* of the unreflecting multitude, who with difficulty contemplate abstract truths. The new converts were to be taught, that those are *born again*, who are initiated by baptism into the Christian worship, and that they ought to exhibit in their conduct the innocence of little infants; and therefore *milk* and *honey*, the common food of infants, was administered to them. Those who obtained admission to the kingdom of *Christ*, from being the servants of the devil, became the Lord's freed men; and, like newly enlisted soldiers, swore to obey their commander. And to signify this, certain rites were borrowed from military usages, and from the forms of manumission.(6)

§ 7. *Lastly*, not to be tedious; whoever considers that the Christians were collected from among the Jews and from the pagan nations who were accustomed from their earliest years to various ceremonies and superstitious rites, and that the habits of early life are very hard to be laid aside; will perceive, that it would have been little short of a miracle, if nothing corrupt and debasing had found its way into the Christian church. For example; nearly all the people of the East, before the Christian era, were accustomed to worship with their faces directed towards the sun rising. For they all believed that God—whom they supposed to resemble light, or rather to be light, and whom they limited as to place,—had his residence in that part of the heavens where the sun rises. When they became Christians they rejected indeed the erroneous belief; but the custom that originated from it, and which was very ancient and universally prevalent, they retained. Nor to this hour, has it been wholly laid aside. From the same cause originated many Jewish rites, which are still religiously maintained by many Christians, and especially by those who live in eastern countries.(7)

§ 8. The rites themselves, I shall state only summarily; for this extensive subject deserves to be considered by itself, and can not be fully discussed in the narrow limits of our work. The Christians assembled for the worship of God in *private dwelling-houses*, in *caves*, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the *first day* of the week; and here and there, also on the *seventh day*, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Most of them likewise held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter that on which he was crucified. The *hours* of the day allotted to these meetings,

person might attend; and I see not why *Cicero* should inquire so particularly of his friend, (as he does), about the time of these mysteries, if they were nothing but the worship of a deity, in which none but *females* ever bore any part.—*Schl.*]

(6) See *Edm. Mcrill*, Observations, lib. iii., cap. iii. [*C. G. Schwartz*, Diss. de ritibus quibusdam formulisque a manumissione

ad S. Baptismum translatis, Altdorf, 1738, and *J. G. Zentgraf's* Diss. at Jena, under Dr. *Walch*, 1749, de Ritibus Baptismalibus sæculi secundi.—*Schl.*]

(7) See *Jo. Spencer*, de Legibus ritualibus Ebraeor. Prolegom., p. 9, ed. Cantab., and all those who have explained the rites and usages of the Oriental Christians.

varied according to times and circumstances ; very many of them could assemble only in the *evening*, or in the morning *before the dawn* of day. When the Christians were assembled, *prayers* were recited ; (the purport of which, *Tertullian* gives us) ; (8) the holy *scriptures* were read ; (9) short *discourses* on Christian duties were addressed to the people ; *hymns* were sung ; and at last, the *Lord's supper* and the love-feasts were celebrated, the oblations of the people affording them the materials. (10)

§ 9. The Christians of this century consecrated anniversary festivals, in memory of the Saviour's death and resurrection, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles. The day in remembrance of *Christ's* dying and expiating the sins of men, was called the *Passover* or *Easter*, (*Pascha*), because they supposed that *Christ* was crucified on the same day in which the Jews kept their *Passover*. But in observing this festival, the Christians of Asia Minor differed from other Christians, and especially from those of Rome. Both fasted on what was called the *great week*, that on which *Christ* died ;* and in remembrance of the last supper of our Saviour, they held a sacred feast or ate the paschal lamb, just as the Jews did ; which feast, as well as the time of *Christ's* death, they denominated the *Passover* or *Easter*. Now the Asiatic Christians held their paschal feasts on the fourteenth day, or full moon, of the first Jewish month, which was the very time on which the Jews ate their Passover ; and on the third day after this supper they kept the memorial of *Christ's* triumph

(8) *Tertullian*, Apologeticum, cap. 39.

(9) [That other religious books, besides the canonical scriptures, were read in several churches, appears from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., 23, and iii., 3, who informs us, that the first Epistle of *Clement*, and that of *Soter*, bishops of Rome, were publicly read in the church of Corinth ; as was the Shepherd of *Hermas*, in very many churches.—*Tr.*]

(10) [*Pliny*, (Epistolar., l. x., ep. 97), gives some account of the public worship of the Christians, in the beginning of this century : and *Justin Martyr*, near the close of that Apology which he presented to *Antoninus Pius*, A. D. 150, gives the following more full and authentic account : "On the day which is called *Sunday*, all, whether dwelling in the towns or in the villages, hold meetings ; and the Memoires (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of the apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read, as much as the time will permit ; then, the reader closing, the President in a speech, exhorts and excites to an imitation of those excellent examples ; then we all rise, and pour forth united prayers ; and when we close our prayer, as was before said, bread is brought forward, and wine, and water ; and the President utters prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, (ὁσην δυνάμεις ἂν τῷ), and the people respond, by saying *amen* ; and a distribution and participation of the things blessed, takes place to each one present, and to those absent, it is sent by the Deacons. And those who are

prosperous and willing, give what they choose, each according to his own pleasure ; and what is collected, is deposited with the President ; and he carefully relieves the orphans and widows, and those who from sickness or other causes are needy, and also those in prison, and the strangers that are residing with us, and in short, all that have need of help. We all commonly hold our assemblies on *Sunday*, because it is the *first* day on which God converted the darkness and matter, and framed the world ; and *Jesus Christ* our Saviour, on the same day, arose from the dead."—*Justin* makes no mention here of *singing*, as a part of the public worship of Christians. But *Pliny* in his Epistle assures us ; "Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire ; carmenque *Christe*, quasi *Deo*, dicere secum invicem ;" and both the N. Testament, and all antiquity, recognise singing as a part of Christian worship.—*Tr.*]

* [*Dr. Musheem* seems to say, that all Christians agreed in observing the entire week preceding Easter Sunday as a fast. But there was in fact great diversity among them. For *Irenaeus*, in his Epistle to *Victor*, bp. of Rome, (quoted by *Eusebius*, H. E., v. 24), says expressly : "There is dispute not only respecting the day, but also respecting the *form* (ἔνδεξ) of the feast. For some think they ought to fast *one day*, others *two days*, others still *more*, and some limit their fast to *twenty-four hours* diurnal and nocturnal." See *Valesius*, notes in locum.—*Tr.*]

over death, or of his resurrection. This custom, they said they had received from the apostles *John* and *Philip*; and they moreover supported it by the example of *Christ* himself, who celebrated his paschal feast, at the same time with the Jews. But the other Christians put off their *Passover*, that is, their paschal feast, until the evening preceding the festal day sacred to *Christ's* resurrection, [or Saturday evening], and thus connected the memorial of *Christ's* death, with that of his resurrection. And they cited *Peter* and *Paul* as authors of their custom.

§ 10. The Asiatic custom of celebrating Easter, had two great inconveniences, which appeared intolerable to the other Christians, and especially to the Romans. First, by holding their sacred feasts on the very day, on which they supposed *Christ* ate the paschal lamb with his disciples, they interrupted the *fast* of the great week; which appeared to the other Christians to fall little short of a crime. Again, as they always kept the memorial of *Christ's* rising from the dead, on the *third day* after their paschal supper, it unavoidably happened, that they more commonly kept, on some other day of the week than the first or Sunday, called the Lord's day, the festival of *Christ's* resurrection, which in after times was called and is now called the *Passover* or *Easter*. Now the greater part of the Christians deemed it wrong to consecrate any other day than the Lord's day, in remembrance of *Christ's* resurrection. Hence great contention frequently arose from this difference between the Asiatic and the other Christians. In the reign of *Antoninus Pius*, about the middle of this century, *Anicetus* bishop of Rome, and *Polycarp* bishop of Smyrna, investigated this subject with great care at Rome. But the Asiatics could not be induced by any considerations, to give up their custom, which they believed to be handed down to them from *St. John*.(11)

§ 11. Near the close of the century, *Victor* bishop of Rome, was of opinion that the Asiatic Christians ought to be compelled by laws and decrees, to follow the rule adopted by the greater part of the Christian world. Accordingly, after ascertaining the opinions of foreign bishops, he sent an imperious letter to the Asiatic bishops admonishing them to follow the example of other Christians in observing Easter. They replied with spirit, by *Polycrates* bishop of Ephesus, that they would not depart from the holy institution of their ancestors. Irritated by this decision, *Victor* excluded them from his communion, and from that of his church, (not from that of the universal church, which he had not power to do), that is, he pronounced them unworthy to be called his brethren. The progress of this schism was checked by *Irenæus* bishop of Lyons, in letters wisely composed, which he directed to *Victor* and others, and by the Asiatic bishops, who wrote a long letter in their own justification. And thus both parties retained their respective customs, until the council of Nice, in the fourth century, abrogated the Asiatic usages.(12)

(11) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., c. 14, and l. v., c. 24.

(12) What is here stated briefly, is more fully explained in my Comment. de Rebus Christianor. ante Constantinum M., p. 435, &c. I there said, p. 439, that *Peter Faydit* saw the mistake in the common accounts of this controversy. But my memory failed me. On consulting the book, I find, that

he treats of the controversy indeed, but he misunderstood the precise subject of it.—The venerable *Heumann's* tract on this controversy, is republished in the *Sylloge* of his minor works.—[Dr. *Mosheim* thinks the true statement of this controversy is that which he has given; and that many writers have mistaken the points at issue, from not distinguishing between the ancient and the

§ 12. When the Christians celebrated the Lord's supper, which they were accustomed to do chiefly on Sundays, they consecrated a part of the bread and wine of the oblations, by certain prayers pronounced by the president, the bishop of the congregation. The wine was mixed with water, and the bread was divided into small pieces. Portions of the consecrated bread and wine were commonly sent to the absent and the sick, in testimony of fraternal affection towards them.(13) There is much evidence that this most holy rite was regarded as very necessary to the attainment of salvation: and I therefore dare not accuse of error, those who believe that the sacred supper was, in this century, given to infants.(14) Of the *love-feasts*, the notice before given, may be sufficient.

§ 13. Twice a year, namely, at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*,(15) (*Paschatis et Pentecostis diebus*), baptism was publicly administered by the *bishop*, or by the *presbyters* acting by his command and authority. The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept, after they had repeated what they called the *Creed*, (*Symbolum*), and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*. The baptized were signed with the cross, anointed, commended to God by prayer and imposition of hands, and finally directed to taste some milk and honey.(16) The reasons for these ceremonies, must be sought in what has already been said respecting the causes of the ceremonies. Adults were to prepare their minds expressly, by prayers, fasting, and other devotional exercises. *Sponsors* or *godfathers* were, as I apprehend, first employed for adults, and afterwards for children likewise.(17)

more modern application of the term *Passover* or *Easter*.—See *Eusebius*, H. E., v., c. 23, 24. *Socrates*, H. E., v., c. 22. *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., pt. ii., p. 517, &c. *H. Pridcaux*, Connexions, pt. ii., b. v., ann. 162. *Adr. Baillet*, Histoire des Festes, p. 9, &c.—*Tr.*]

(13) See *Henry Rixner*, de Ritibus veterum Christianor. circa Eucharistiam, p. 155, &c., [and the quotation from *Justin Martyr*, in note 10 of this chapter.—*Tr.*]

(14) See *Jo. Fr. Mayer*, Diss. de eucharistia infantum; and *Peter Zornius*, Historia eucharistiæ infantum, Berol., 1736, 8vo.

(15) See *W. Wall*, History of infant Baptism, vol. i., p. 277, 279, of the Latin edition by *Schlösser*: *Jos. Vicecomes*, de Ritibus baptismi, Paris, 1618, 8vo.

(16) See especially, *Tertullian*, de Baptismo, [and respecting the honey and milk, *Tertullian*, de Corona, c. 3; and *Clemens Alex.*, Paedag., l. i., c. 6.—*Schl.*]

(17) See *Ger. van Mastricht*, de Susceptoribus infantum ex baptismo, edit. 2d, Frankf., 1727, 4to. He thinks sponsors were used for children, and not for adults; p. 15. See also *W. Wall*, Hist. of infant Baptism, vol. i., p. 69, 474, &c.—[The manner of receiving new converts into the churches, about the year 150, is thus minutely described by *Justin Martyr*, in his (so called)

second *Apology*, towards the conclusion.

"In what manner we dedicate ourselves to God, after being renewed by *Christ*, we will now explain; lest by omitting this, we should seem to dissemble in our statement. Those who believe and are persuaded, that the things we teach and inculcate are true, and who profess ability thus to live, are directed to pray, with fasting, and to ask of God the forgiveness of their former sins; we also fasting and praying with them. Then we conduct them to a place where there is water; and they are regenerated [baptized], in the manner in which we have been regenerated [baptized]; for they receive a washing with water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Saviour, *Jesus Christ*, and of the Holy Spirit. For *Christ* said; *Except ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*"—"This washing is likewise called *illumination*; because the minds of those who have learned these things, are enlightened. And whoever is enlightened, is washed in the name of *Jesus Christ*, who was crucified under *Pontius Pilate*; and in the name of the Holy Spirit, who by the prophets foretold all that relates to *Christ*."—"And after thus washing the convinced and consenting person, we conduct him to where the brethren as we call them are as-

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SEPARATIONS OR HERESIES.

§ 1. Discord among the Jewish Christians.—§ 2. Hence the Nazareans and Ebionites.—§ 3. Their Impiety.—§ 4. The Sects originating from the Oriental Philosophy.—§ 5. Elxai and Elcesaites.—§ 6. Saturninus ; his Extravagances.—§ 7. Cerdo and Marcion.—§ 8. Bardesanes.—§ 9. Tatian and the Encratites.—§ 10. Peculiar Sentiments of the Egyptian Gnostics.—§ 11. Basilides.—§ 12. His Enormities.—§ 13. His Moral Principles.—§ 14. Carpocrates.—§ 15. Valentinus.—§ 16. His Extravagances.—§ 17. Various Sects of Valentinians.—§ 18. The minor Sects of Valentinians.—§ 19. The Ophites.—§ 20. Monarchians and Patripassians.—§ 21. Theodotus, Artemon.—§ 22. Hermogenes.—§ 23. The illiterate Sects. Montanus.—§ 24. The Success of Montanus, and his Doctrine.

§ 1. AMONG the Christian sects that arose in this century, the first place is due to those Jewish Christians, whose zeal for the Mosaic law severed them from the other believers in *Christ*.(1) The rise of this sect took place in the reign of *Adrian*. For, when this emperor had wholly destroyed Jerusalem a second time, and had enacted severe laws against the Jews, the greater part of the Christians living in Palestine, that they might not be confounded with Jews as they had been, laid aside the Mosaic ceremonies, and chose one *Mark*, who was a foreigner and not a Jew, for their bishop. This procedure was very offensive to those among them, whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was too strong to be eradicated. They therefore separated from their brethren, and formed a distinct society in *Peraea*, a part of Palestine, and in the neighbouring regions ; and among them, the Mosaic law retained all its dignity unimpaired.(2)

scumbled ; and there offer our united supplications, with earnestness, both for ourselves and for the enlightened person, and for all others every where ; that we may conduct ourselves as becomes those who have received the truth, and by our deeds prove ourselves good citizens, and observers of what is commanded us ; so that we may be saved with an eternal salvation. And on ending our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Then, there is placed before the President of the brethren, bread, and a cup of water and wine ; which he taking, offers praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at great length, that such blessings are vouchsafed us ; and when he ends the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present respond, *amen*. Now the word *amen*, in the Hebrew tongue, signifies *so be it*. And after the President has given thanks, and all the people have uttered the response, those whom we call Deacons, distribute to every one present, to

partake of the bread and the wine and water, over which thanks were given : and to those not present, the Deacons carry it. And this food is called by us the *Eucharist* ; which it is unlawful for any one to partake of, unless he believes the things taught by us to be true, and has been washed with the washing for the remission of sins in regeneration, and lives according to what *Christ* has taught.” —*Tr.*]

(1) [The origin, names, and diversity of opinion, of this class of sects, are well stated by *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., part ii., p. 603-626.—*Tr.*]

(2) See *Sulpitius Severus*, *Historia sacra*, l. ii., c. 31, p. 245, &c., [p. 381, ed. Hornii, 1647. He says : “ *Adrian* stationed a regiment of soldiers as a constant guard, to prevent all Jews from entering Jerusalem ; which was advantageous to the Christian faith ; because, at that time, nearly all [the Jewish Christians] believed in *Christ* as God, yet with an observance of the Law.” —*Tr.*]

§ 2. This body of people who would unite *Moses* and *Christ*, was again divided into two classes, differing widely in their opinions and customs, the *Nazareans* and the *Ebionites*. The former are not reckoned, by the ancient Christians, among heretics ;(3) but the latter are placed among those sects which subverted the foundations of religion. Both sects used a history of *Christ* or a *Gospel*, which was different from our *Gospels*.(4) The word *Nazarean* was not the name of a sect, but was equivalent to the word *Christian*. For those who bore the title of *Christians* among the Greeks, were among the Jews called *Nazareans* ; and they did not esteem it a name of disgrace. Those who after their separation from their brethren, retained this original name imposed on the disciples of *Christ* by the Jews, believed *Christ* to be born of a virgin, and to be in some way united with the divine nature. And although they would not discard the ceremonies prescribed by *Moses*, yet they would not obtrude them upon the Gentile Christians. They moreover rejected the additions to the Mosaic ritual, made by the doctors of the law and by the Pharisees.(5) It is therefore easy to see, why the other Christians in general judged more favourably of them.

§ 3. Whether the *Ebionites* derived their name from a man [called *Ebion*], or were so denominated on account of their *poverty* either in regard to property or sentiment, is uncertain.(6) But they were much worse than the *Nazareans*. For though they supposed *Christ* to be an ambassador of God and endowed with divine power, yet they conceived him to be a man, born in the ordinary course of nature, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*. They maintained that the ceremonial law of *Moses* must be observed, not by the Jews only, but by all who wished to obtain salvation ; and therefore, *St. Paul*, that strenuous opposer of the law, they viewed with abhorrence. Nor were they satisfied with the mere rites which *Moses* appointed, but observed with equal veneration the superstitious rites of their ancestors, and the customs of the Pharisees which were added to the law.(7)

(3) The first that ranked the *Nazareans* among the heretics, was *Epiphanius*, a writer of the fourth century, of no great fidelity, or accuracy of judgment. [*A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., part ii., p. 619, 620, thinks the *Nazareans*, described by *Epiphanius*, were descendants of the *Ebionites*, who had now imbibed some Gnostic principles. The names *Ebionites* and *Nazareans* are often confounded, both by ancients and moderns.—*Tr.*]

(4) See *J. A. Fabricius*, Codex Apocryph. N. T., tom. i., p. 355, &c., and *Moshem*, Vindiciæ, contra Tolandi Nazarenum, p. 112, &c. [*Jones*, on the Canon of the New Test., vol. i., and the authors of Introductions to the New Test.—*Tr.*]

(5) See *Mich. le Quen*, Adnotatt. ad Damascenum, tom. i., p. 82, 83, and his Diss. de Nazarenis et eorum fide ; which is the 7th of his dissertations subjoined to his edition of the Works of *Damascenus*. [*C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 101, &c.—*Schl.*]

(6) See *Fabricius*, ad Philastr. de hæresibus, p. 81. *Thom. Ittig*, de hæresibus ævi Apostolici, [also note (22) on cent. i., part ii., ch. v., p. 96, and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., part ii., p. 612, &c.—*Tr.*]

(7) *Irenæus*, contra Hæreses, lib. i., cap. 26. *Epiphanius* treats largely of the *Ebionites*, in his Panarium, hæres. xxx. But he is worthy of no credit ; for he acknowledges, (§ 3, p. 127, and § 14, p. 141), that he has joined the *Sampsacæus* and the *Elcesaites* with the *Ebionites*, and that the first *Ebionites* did not hold the errors which he attributes to the sects.—[The correctness of *Epiphanius*, as a historian, is often called in question ; and perhaps justly. But if the term *Ebionites* designated a variety of minor sects, all of them Jewish Christians ; and if some of these sects had, in the 4th century, imbibed Gnostic sentiments, unknown to the original *Ebionites* ; then *Epiphanius* may here be entirely correct ; which others suppose to be the fact. See *Neander*, as cited above, note (3).—*Tr.*]

§ 4. These little and obscure sects were not very detrimental to the Christian cause. Much greater disturbance was produced by those, whose founders explained the doctrines of Christianity agreeably to the precepts of the Oriental philosophy in regard to the origin of evil. These latter sects, concealed and unnoticed previously to this century, came forth from their obscurity during the reign of *Adrian*,⁽⁸⁾ and gathered churches of considerable magnitude in various countries. A long catalogue of these semi-Christian sects, might be gathered out of the writings of the ancients: but of the greater part of them, we know no more than their names; and perhaps some of them differed only in name, from each other. Those which acquired notoriety beyond others, may be divided into two classes. The first class originated in Asia, and maintained the philosophy of the East in regard to the origin of the universe, (if I may so say), pure and uncorrupt; the other class, founded among the Egyptians, and by Egyptians, mingled with that philosophy many monstrous opinions and principles current in Egypt. The systems of the former were more simple and intelligible; those of the latter were much more complicated, and more difficult of explication.

§ 5. In the Asiatic class, the first place seems to belong to *Elxai*, a Jew, who is said to have founded the sect of the *Elcesaites* in the reign of *Trajan*. Though he was a Jew, and both worshipped one God and revered *Moses*; yet he corrupted the religion of his fathers by many false notions derived from the philosophy and superstition of the Orientals, and, after the example of the Essenes, expounded the Mosaic law according to reason, or in other words, made it an allegory. But *Epiphanius*, who had read one of *Elxai's* books, acknowledges himself in doubt whether the *Elcesaites* should be reckoned among the Christian sects, or among the Jewish. *Elxai* mentions *Christ* in his book, and speaks honourably of him; but he does not add enough to make it manifest, whether *Jesus of Nazareth* was the Christ of whom he speaks.⁽⁹⁾

§ 6. If *Elxai* be not reckoned, *Saturninus* of Antioch will justly stand at the head of this class; at least he lived earlier than all the other *Gnostic* heresiarchs, [having taught his doctrine in the reign of *Adrian*.—*Tr.*] He supposed *two first causes* of all things, the *good God*, and *matter*; the latter, evil in its nature, and subject to a Lord. The world and the first men were created by seven angels—that is, by the rulers of the seven planets, without the knowledge of God, and against the will of the lord of matter. But God approved of the work when it was completed, imparted rational souls to the men who before had only animal life, and divided the entire world into seven parts, which he subjected to the seven creators, of whom the God of the Jews was one, reserving however the supreme power to himself.¹ To these good men—that is, men possessed of wise and good souls, the Lord of matter opposed another sort of men, to whom he imparted a malignant soul. And hence the great difference between good and bad men. After the creators of the world had revolted from the supreme God,

(8) *Clemens Alex.*, *Stromat.*, l. vii., c. 17, p. 898. *Cyprian*, *epist.* lxxv., p. 144, and others.

(9) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vi., c. 38. *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* xix., § 3, p. 41. *Theodoret*, *Fabul. haeret.*, lib. ii., c. 7, p. 221.

[Of these *Elcesaites*, who were also called *Sampsacans*, every thing afforded by antiquity, that is important, has been collected by *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, vol. i., p. 587, &c. He justly accounts them enthusiasts.—*Schl.*]

he sent down *Christ* from heaven, clothed, not with a real body, but with the shadow of one, that in our world he might destroy the kingdom of the Lord of matter, and point out to the good souls the way of returning back to God. But this way is a hard and difficult one. For the souls that would ascend to God after the dissolution of the body, must abstain from flesh, wine, marriage, and from all things which either exhilarate the body or delight the senses.—*Saturninus* taught in Syria, which was his native country, and especially at Antioch ; and he drew many after him, by his great show of virtue.(10)

§ 7. In the same class of Asiatic Gnostics, must be placed *Cerdo*, a Syrian, and *Marcion*, the son of a bishop of Pontus. The history of these men is obscure and uncertain. It appears, however, that they first began to found their sect at Rome ; that *Cerdo* taught his principles there before the arrival of *Marcion* ; that *Marcion*, failing to obtain some office in the church at Rome in consequence of some misconduct, went over to the party of *Cerdo*, and with great success they propagated their tenets over the world. In the manner of the Orientals, *Marcion* taught that there are *two first causes* of all things, the one perfectly *good*, the other perfectly *evil*. Intermediate between these two deities, ranks the Architect of this lower world, whom men worship, and who was the God and the Lawgiver of the Jews : for he is neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature, or, as *Marcion* expressed it, he is *just* ; and therefore he can dispense punishments, as well as rewards. The evil Deity and the Creator of the world are perpetually at war. Each wishes to be worshipped as God, and to subject the inhabitants of the whole world to himself. The Jews are the subjects of the Creator of the world, who is a very powerful spirit or demon ; the other nations, which worship many gods, are subjects of the evil deity. Each is an oppressor of rational souls, and holds them in bondage. In order therefore to put an end to this war, and to give freedom to human souls which are of divine origin, the Supreme God sent among the Jews *Jesus Christ*, who is very similar to himself in nature, or his Son, clothed with the appearance or shadow of a body, which would render him visible ; with commission to destroy both the kingdom of the world's Creator and that of the evil deity, and to invite souls back to God. He was assailed both by the prince of darkness [the evil deity], and by the God of the Jews, or the world's Creator ; but they were unable to hurt him, because he had only the appearance of a body. Whoever will abstract their minds from all sensible objects, according to *his* prescriptions, and, renouncing as well the laws of the God of the Jews as those of the prince of darkness, will turn wholly to the supreme God, and at the same time subdue and mortify their bodies by fasting and other means, shall, after death, ascend to the celestial mansions. The moral discipline which *Marcion* prescribed to his followers was, as the nature of the system required, very austere and rigorous. For he condemned marriages, wine, flesh, and whatever is grateful and pleasant to the body.—*Marcion* had numerous fol-

(10) *Irenæus*, l. i., c. 24. *Euseb.*, Hist. Eccl., l. iv., c. 7. *Epiphani.*, Hæres. xxiii. *Theodoret*, Fabul. hæret., l. i., c. 2, and the other writers on the heresies. [Among the modern writers, see *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 336, &c. C. W. F. Walch,

Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 274, &c. *Ittig*, de Hæresiarch. sæcul. ii., c. 1. *Tillemont*, Memoires pour servir à l'histoire de l'Eglise, tom. ii., p. 215, and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 759, &c. —Tr.]

lowers; among whom *Lucan*, or *Lucian*, *Severus*, *Blastes*, and others, but especially *Appelles*, are said to have deviated in some respects from the opinions of their master, and to have established new sects.(11)

§ 8. *Bardesan*es and *Tatian* are commonly supposed to have been of the school of *Valentinus* the Egyptian, but erroneously; for their systems differ in many respects from that of the Valentinians, and come nearer to the Oriental principle of two first causes of all things. *Bardesan*es was a Syrian of Edessa, a man of great acumen, and distinguished for his many learned productions. Seduced by his attachment to the Oriental philosophy, he placed in opposition to the supreme God who is absolute goodness, a prince of darkness who is the author of all evil. The supreme God created the world free from all evil, and formed men possessed of celestial souls and of subtle, ethereal bodies. But when the prince of darkness had induced those first men to sin, God permitted the author of all evil to invest men with gross bodies formed out of sinful matter, and also to corrupt the world, in order that men might suffer for the iniquity they had committed. Hence the struggle between reason and concupiscence in man. *Jesus* therefore descended from the celestial regions, clothed not with a real but with a celestial and ethereal body, and taught men to subdue their depraved bodies, and to free themselves from the bondage of vicious matter, by means of abstinence, meditation, and fasting; and whoever will do so, shall on the dissolution of the body ascend to the mansions of the blessed, clothed in their ethereal vehicles or their celestial bodies. *Bardesan*es himself afterwards returned to sounder sentiments; but his sect long survived in Syria.(12)

§ 9. *Tatian*, by birth an Assyrian, a distinguished and learned man, and disciple of *Justin Martyr*, was more noted among the ancients for his austere moral principles, which were rigid beyond measure, than for the speculative errors or dogmas which he proposed as articles of faith to his followers. Yet it appears from credible witnesses, that he held *matter* to be the source of all evil, and therefore recommended the abhorrence and the mortification of the body; that he supposed the Creator of the world and the true God were not one and the same being; that he denied to our Saviour a real body; and corrupted Christianity with other doctrines of the Oriental philosophers. His followers, who were numerous, were sometimes called from him, *Tatiani* or *Tatianists*; but more frequently they were designated by names indicative of their austere morals. For, as they discarded all the external comforts and conveniences of life, and held wine in such abhorrence as to use mere water in the Lord's supper, fasted rigorously, and lived in celibacy; they were denominated

(11) Besides the common writers on the heresies, as *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, &c., see *Tertullian's* five Books against Marcion; and the Poem against Marcion, also in five Books, which is ascribed to *Tertullian*; and the Dialogue against the Marcionites, which is ascribed to *Origen*. Among the modern writers, see *Massuet*, the editor of *Irenæus*; *Tillemont*; *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii., p. 69, &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzerereyen*, vol. i., p. 484–537. *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 401–410. *A. Ne-*

ander, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 779–807.—*Tr.*]

(12) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iv., c. 30, and the writers on the ancient heresies. *Origen*, *Dial. contra Marcionitas*, § 3, p. 70, ed. Wetstein. *Fred. Strunzius*, *Historia Bardesanis et Bardesanistar.* Wittemb., 1722, 4to. *Beausobre*, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, vol. ii., p. 128, &c. [*Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 394, &c. *C. W. F. Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzerereyen*, vol. i., p. 407–424. *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 743, &c.—*Tr.*]

Encratitæ or *abstainers*, *Hydroparastatæ* or *Water-drinkers*, and *Apotactitæ* or *Renouncers*.(13)

§ 10. The Gnostics of the Egyptian class, differed from those of the Asiatic, by combining the Oriental with Egyptian philosophy, and more especially in the following particulars. (I.) Although they supposed matter to be eternal, and also animated; yet they did not recognise an eternal prince of darkness and of matter, or the malignant deity of the Persians. (II.) They generally considered *Christ* our Saviour, as consisting of *two persons*, the man *Jesus*, and the Son of God, or *Christ*: and the latter, the divine person, they supposed entered into *Jesus* the man, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*, and parted from him, when he was made a prisoner by the Jews. (III.) They attributed to *Christ* a real, and not an imaginary body; though they were not all of one sentiment on this point. (IV.) They prescribed to their followers a much milder system of moral discipline; nay, seemed to give precepts which favoured the corrupt propensities of men.

§ 11. Among the Egyptian Gnostics, the first place is commonly assigned to *Basilides* of Alexandria. He maintained, that the supreme and all perfect God produced, from himself, seven most excellent beings or *Aeons*. Two of these *Aeons*, namely *Dynamis* and *Sophia*, (*Power* and *Wisdom*), procreated the angels of the highest order. Those angels built for themselves a residence or heaven, and produced other angels of a nature a little inferior. Other generations of angels succeeded, and other heavens were built, until there were three hundred and sixty-five heavens, and as many orders of angels; that is, just as many as there are days in a year. Over all these heavens and angelic orders, there is a Prince or Lord, whom *Basilides* called *Abraxas*; a word which was doubtless in use among the Egyptians before *Basilides*, and which, when written in Greek, contains letters that together make up the number 365, i. e., the number of the heavens.(14) The inhabitants of the lowest heaven, contiguous to

(13) The only work of *Tatian* that has reached us, is his *Oratio ad Græcos*. His opinions are spoken of by *Clement Alex.*, *Strom.*, l. iii., p. 460. *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.*, xlv., c. 1, p. 391. *Origen*, *de Oratione*, c. 13, p. 77, ed. Oxon., and by others of the ancients: but no one of them has attempted to delineate his system. [Of the moderns, see *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i., p. 445–447, and *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., pt. ii., p. 762–766.—It should be remembered, that the names *Encratites*, *Apotactites*, (Ἐγκρατῖται, Ἀποτακτοί), were applied to all the austere sects; so that, though all *Tatianists* were *Encratites*, yet all *Encratites* were not *Tatianists*.—Tr.]

(14) A great number of gems still exist, and quantities of them are daily brought to us from Egypt, on which, besides other figures of Egyptian device, the word *Abraxas* is engraved. See *Jo. Macarius*, *Abraxas seu de gemmis Basilidianis disquisitio*; enlarged by *Jo. Chifflet*, ed. Antwerp, 1657, 4to. *Bern. de Montfaucon*, *Palæograph.*

Græcæ, l. ii., c. 8, p. 177, &c., and others. Learned men almost universally, think those gems originated from *Basilides*; and hence they are called *gemmæ Basilidianæ*. But very many of them exhibit marks of the most degrading superstition, such as cannot be attributed even to a semi-Christian; and likewise very manifest insignia of the Egyptian religion. They cannot all therefore be attributed to *Basilides*, who, though he held many errors, yet worshipped *Christ*. Those only must refer to him, which bear some marks of Christianity. The word *Abraxas*, was unquestionably used by the ancient Egyptians, and appropriated to the Lord of the heavens; so that *Basilides* retained it from the philosophy and religion of his country. See *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, vol. ii., p. 51. *Jo. Bapt. Passeri*, *Diss. de Gemmis Basilidianis*; in his splendid work *de Gemmis stelliferis*, tom. ii., p. 221, &c, ed. Florent., 1750, fol. *P. E. Jablonski*, *de Nominis Abraxas significatione*; in the *Miscellan. Lipsiens. novis*, tom. vii. *Passeri* contends that none of

eternal matter which is an animated and malignant substance, formed a design of constructing a world out of that disorderly mass, and of fabricating men. God approved the work when it was finished; and imparted rational souls to the men whom the angels had formed, whereas, before they had only sensitive souls: he also gave to the angels, dominion over men. The Prince of these angels chose the Jewish nation for *his* subjects; and he gave them a law by *Moses*. The other angels presided over other nations.

§ 12. The angels who created and governed the world, gradually became corrupt; and they not only laboured to obliterate the knowledge of the supreme God, in order that they might themselves be worshipped as gods, but they waged war with each other, for the enlargement of their respective territories. The most arrogant and restless of them all, was he who governed the Jewish nation. Therefore the supreme God, in compassion to the souls endowed with reason, sent down from heaven his *Son*, or the prince of the *Aeons*, whose name is *Nus*, [νοῦς, mind], and *Christ*; that he, joining himself to the man *Jesus*, might restore the lost knowledge of his Father, and overturn the empire of the angels who governed the world, and especially of the insolent Lord of the Jews. The God of the Jews perceiving this, ordered his subjects to seize the man *Jesus*, and put him to death: but against *Christ*, he had no power.(15) The souls that obey the precepts of the Son of God, will ascend to God when their bodies die: the rest will pass into other bodies. All bodies return back to vicious matter, whence they originated.

§ 13. The moral system of *Basilides*, if we believe most of the ancients, favoured concupiscence, and allowed every species of iniquity. But from much surer testimony it appears, that he recommended purity of life and the practice of piety, and condemned even an inclination to sin. Still there were some things in his moral precepts which greatly offended other Christians. For he held it lawful to conceal our religion, to deny *Christ* when our life is in danger, to participate in the pagan feasts which followed their sacrifices; and he detracted much from the estimation and honour in which the martyrs were held, and maintained that they were greater sinners than other men, and were visited by divine justice for their iniquities. For it was a principle with him, that none but sinners suffer any evil in this life. And hence arose the suspicions entertained respecting his system of morals, suspicions which seemed to be confirmed by the flagitious lives of some of his disciples.(16)

these gems have reference to *Basilides*: he makes them all refer to the magicians, or the soothsayers, sorcerers, conjurers, and fortune-tellers. But this learned man, it appears to me, goes too far; for he himself acknowledges, (p. 225), that he sometimes found on them some vestiges of the *Basilidian errors*. These celebrated gems still need an erudite, but cautious and judicious interpreter. [See the references in *Gieseler's Text-book*, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 84, note 1.—*Tr.*]

(15) Many of the ancients tell us, on the authority of *Irenæus*, [adv. Hæreses, i., c. 23], that, according to *Basilides'* opinion,

our Saviour had not a *real* body; and that *Simon* the Cyrenian was crucified in place of him. But that this is erroneous, and that *Basilides* supposed the man *Jesus* and *Christ*, united, to constitute the Saviour, is demonstrated in the *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.*, &c., p. 354, &c. It may be, that here and there a follower of *Basilides* held otherwise.

(16) Besides the ancient writers on the heresies, *Basilides* is particularly treated of, by *Ben. Massuet*, *Dissert. in Irenæum*; and *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, vol. ii., p. 8, &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. i., p. 281-309;

§ 14. But much viler than he, and said to be the worst of all the Gnostics, was *Carpocrates*, also of Alexandria, [who lived in the reign of *Adrian*]. His philosophy did not differ in its general principles, from that of the other Egyptian Gnostics. For he held to one supreme God, *Aeons* the offspring of God, eternal and malignant matter, the creation of the world from evil matter by angels, divine souls unfortunately enclosed in bodies, and the like. But he maintained that *Jesus* was born of *Joseph* and *Mary* in the ordinary course of nature, and that he was superior to other men in nothing but fortitude and greatness of soul. He also not only gave his disciples license to sin, but imposed on them the necessity of sinning, by teaching that the way to eternal salvation was open to those souls only, which committed all kinds of enormity and wickedness.—But it exceeds all credibility, that any man who believes there is a God, that *Christ* is the Saviour of mankind, and who inculcates any sort of religion, should hold such sentiments. Besides, there are grounds to believe that *Carpocrates*, like the other Gnostics, held the Saviour to be composed of the man *Jesus* and a certain Aeon called *Christ*; and that he imposed some laws of conduct on his disciples. Yet undoubtedly, there was something in his opinions and precepts that rendered his piety very suspicious. For he held that concupiscence was implanted in the soul by the Deity, and is therefore perfectly innocent; that all actions are in themselves indifferent, and become good or evil only according to the opinions and laws of men; that in the purpose of God, all things are common property, even the women, but that such as will use their rights are by human laws accounted thieves and adulterers. Now if he did not add some corrective to the enormity of these principles, it must be acknowledged, that he wholly swept away the foundations of all virtue, and gave full license to all iniquity. (17)

§ 15. *Valentinus*, also an Egyptian, exceeded all his fellow-heresiarchs both in fame and in the multitude of his followers. His sect had its birth at Rome, grew to maturity in the island of Cyprus, and with wonderful celerity traversed Asia, Africa, and Europe. *Valentinus* held the general principles common with his brother Gnostics, and he assumed the title of a *Gnostic*; yet he held several principles peculiar to himself. In the *Pleroma*, (which is the Gnostic name for the habitation of God), he supposed thirty Aeons, fifteen males, and as many females. Besides these, there were four unmarried; namely, *Horus*, [*ἑρως*], the guardian of the confines of the *Pleroma*, *Christ*, the *Holy Spirit*, and *Jesus*. The youngest of the Aeons, *Sophia*, (*Wisdom*), fired with vast desire of comprehending the nature of the supreme Deity, in her agitation, brought forth a daughter

Mosheim, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 342–361; and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 679–704. See also *Gieseler's* Text-book, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 84, &c.—*Tr.*]

(17) See *Irenæus*, contra Hæres., l. i., c. 25. *Clemens Alex.*, Stromat., l. iii., p. 511, and the others. [*Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 361–371. *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzer., vol. i., p. 309–327. *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., part ii., p. 767–773.—*Carpocrates* left a young son, *Epiphanes*, to propagate his system; and this son, though he died at the age of 17,

wrote a book, from which the world have had to learn what they could of the tenets of *Carpocrates*. It is doubtful whether he ought to be called a Christian. He was an Egyptian philosopher, who had perhaps borrowed some notions from the Christians, but still his philosophy was his cynosure. Two inscriptions, in the true spirit of this philosopher, recently discovered in Cyrene in Africa, have given rise to a conjecture, that his sect continued till the sixth century. See the inscriptions, with comments, in the Christmas Programm of Dr. *W. Geseuius*, A.D. 1825.—*Tr.*]

called *Achamoth* [חַכְמֹת, *the sciences or philosophy*], who being excluded from the Plerōma, descended to the rude and shapeless mass of matter, reduced it to some degree of order, and by the aid of *Jesus* brought forth *Demiurgus*, [Δημιουργός, *Artificer*], the builder and lord of all things. This *Demiurgus* separated the more subtle or *animal* matter, from the grosser or *material*; and out of the former he framed the world above us, or the visible heavens, and out of the latter, the lower world, or this earth. Men he compounded of both kinds of matter; and his mother, *Achamoth*, added to them a third substance which was celestial and spiritual. This is a brief outline of the complicated and tedious fable of *Valentinus*. It appears that he explained the origin of the world, and of the human race, in a more subtle manner than the other Gnostics; yet that he did not differ from them in reality. And the same is true of the other parts of his system.

§ 16. The Architect of the world, gradually became so inflated, that he either thought himself to be, or at least wished men to regard him as the only God; and by his prophets whom he sent among the Jews, he arrogated to himself the honours of the supreme God. And herein the other angels, who presided over parts of the created universe, imitated his example. To repress this insolence of *Demiurgus*, and to imbue souls with a knowledge of the true God, *Christ* descended, being composed of an animal and spiritual substance, and moreover clothed with an ethereal body. He passed through the body of *Mary*, just as water through a canal; and to him *Jesus*, one of the highest Aeons, joined himself, when he was baptized in Jordan by *John*. The Architect of the world, who perceived that his dominion would be shaken by this divine man, caused him to be seized and crucified. But before Christ came to execution, not only *Jesus* the Son of God, but also the rational soul of Christ, forsook him; so that only his sentient soul and his ethereal body were suspended on the cross. Those who renounce, as Christ directs, not only the worship of the pagan deities, but also that of the Jewish God, and surrender their sentient and concupiscent soul to reason, to be chastened and reformed, shall with both their souls, the rational and the sentient, be admitted to the mansions of the blessed near the Plerōma. And when all particles of the divine nature, or all souls, shall be separated from matter and purified, then a raging fire shall spread through this material universe, and destroy the whole fabric of nature. For the whole Oriental philosophy and the system of the Gnostics, may be reduced to this epitome: This world is composed of both good and evil. Whatever of good there is in it, was derived from the supreme God, the parent of light, and will return to him again; and when this takes place, this world will be destroyed.(18)

(18) Of the Valentinian system, we have a full account in *Irenæus*, contra Haeres, lib. i., c. 1-7. *Tertullian*, Liber contra Valentinianos; *Clemens Alex.*, passim; and in all the ancient writers on the heresies. Among the moderns, see *Jo. Fr. Buddeus*, Diss. de Haeresi Valentiniana; subjoined to his Introductio in Historiam philosoph. Ebraeorum; which Diss. has occasioned much discussion respecting the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have attempted to give a rational explanation of the intri-

cate and absurd system of Valentinus. See *Souverain*, Platonisme dévoilé, cap. viii., p. 68. *Camp. Vitringa*, Observatt. Sacrae, lib. i., c. ii., p. 131. *Beausobre*, Histoire du Manichéisme, p. 548, &c. *Ja. Basnage*, Hist. des Juifs, tome iii., p. 729, &c. *Peter Faydit*, Eclairciss. sur l'Hist. Eccles. des ii. premiers siècles, p. 12, who also contemplated writing an Apology for Valentinus. I pass by *Godfrey Arnold*, the patron of all the heretics. But how vain all such attempts must be, is proved by this, that Valentinus

§ 17. The ancients represent the school of *Valentinus* as divided into many branches. Among these were the *Ptolomaitic* sect, whose author *Ptolomy* differed from his master respecting the number and nature of the *Aeons*; the *Secundian* sect, established by *Secundus*, one of the principal followers of *Valentinus*, who seems to have kept more closely to the Oriental philosophy, and to have held to *two first causes* of all things, *light* and *darkness*, or a prince of good, and a prince of evil; the sect of *Heracleon*, from whose books *Clement* and *Origen* quote much; the sect of *Marcus* and *Calarbasus*, called *Marcosians*, who, according to *Irenæus*, added much that was senseless and absurd, to the fictions of *Valentinus*, though it is certain, that they did not maintain all that is attributed to them. I pass by other sects, which appear to have originated from the *Valentinian* system. But whether all the sects which are called *Valentinian*, actually originated from disciples and followers of *Valentinus*, appears very doubtful, to such as consider how great mistakes the ancients have made in stating the origin of the heretics. (19)

§ 18. Of the smaller and more obscure *Gnostic* sects, of which the ancients tell us little more than the names and perhaps one or two detached sentiments, it is unnecessary to say anything. Such were the *Adamites*, who are said to have wished to imitate the state of innocence: (20) the *Cainites*, who are represented as paying respect to the memory of *Cain*, *Corah*, *Dathan*, the inhabitants of *Sodom*, and *Judas* the traitor: (21) the *Abelites*, whom the ancients represent as marrying wives, but raising up no children: (22) the *Sethites*, who regarded *Seth* as the *Messi-*

himself professed that his religion differed fundamentally from that of the other Christians. [Besides the authors above referred to, see *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 371-389; *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ketzerereyen, vol. i., p. 335-386; and *Aug. Neander*, Kircheng., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 704-731; also *Gieseler's* Text-book, by Cunningham, vol. i., p. 85, &c.—*Tr.*]

(19) Besides *Irenæus*, and the other ancient writers; see, concerning these sects, *Jo. Ern. Grabe*, Spicilegium Patrum et hæreticorum, sæcul. ii., p. 69, 82, &c. On the *Marcosians*, *Irenæus* is copious, lib. i., cap. 14. That *Marcus* was out of his senses, is unquestionable; for he must have been derauged, if he could hold even the greater part of the strange fancies, which are said to belong to his system. [Among the moderns who have treated of these sects, see *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. i., p. 387-401; and *A. Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. pt. ii., p. 731-746.—*Tr.*]

(20) [See, for an account of them, *Clement Alex.*, Stromat., lib. i., p. 357, lib. iii., p. 525, lib. vii., p. 854: *Tertullian*, Scorpiacum, in Opp., p. 633, and contra Prax., cap. 3: *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lii., Opp., tom. i., p. 459: *Theodoret*, Haeret. Fabul., lib. i., c. 6: *Augustine*, de Haeres., c. 31: *John Damascen*, Opp., tom. i., p. 88; and among the moderns, *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ket-

zerereyen, vol. i., p. 327-335. *P. Bayle*, Dictionnaire historique, art. Adamites and Prodicus: *Tillemont*, Memoires, &c., tom. ii., p. 256: *Beausobre*, Diss. sur les Adamites; subjoined to *Lenfant's* Histoire des Husesites.—The accounts of the ancients are contradictory; and several of the moderns doubt, whether there ever was a sect who performed their worship in a state of nudity.—*Tr.*]

(21) [All the ancient writers mentioned in the preceding note, except *John Damascen*, speak of the *Cainites*; but what they state is very brief, and contradictory. The correctness of their accounts, is justly doubted by *Bayle*, (Dictionnaire Historique, art. Cainites), and by others. *Origen*, (contra Celsum, lib. iii., p. 119), did not regard them as Christians. Yet they might be a sect of Gnostics, who holding the God of the Jews for a revolter from the true God, regarded *Cain*, *Dathan*, *Corah*, and others who resisted him, as being very praiseworthy.—*Tr.*]

(22) [The *Abelites* are mentioned only by *Augustine*, de Haeres., cap. 87; and by the author of the book, *Prædestinatus*, cap. 87. It is represented, that every man married a female child, and every woman a little boy, with whom they lived, and whom they made their heirs; hoping in this way to fulfil literally, what *Paul* says, 1 Cor. vii., 29, that "They that have wives, be as though they had none."—The sect is treated of by *C.*

ah:(23) the *Florinians*, who originated at Rome, under *Florinus* and *Blastus*; (24) and many others. Perhaps the ancient Christian doctors divided one sect into several, deceived by the fact of its having several names; they may also have had incorrect information respecting some of them.

§ 19. Among the Gnostics of the Egyptian class, no inconsiderable place must be assigned to the *Ophites* or *Serpentians*; a senseless sect, of which one *Euphrates* is said to be the father. The sect originated among the Jews, and before the Christian era. A part of them became professed Christians; the rest retained their former superstition. Hence there were two sects of Ophites, a Christian sect, and an anti-Christian. The Christian Ophites held nearly the same notions, with the other Egyptian Gnostics, concerning Aeons, the eternity of matter, the creation of the world without the knowledge or consent of the Deity, the rulers of the seven planets who presided over the world, the tyranny of *Demiurgus*, the descent of *Christ* joined to the man *Jesus* into our world to overthrow the kingdom of *Demiurgus*, &c. But they held this peculiarity, that they supposed the *serpent* which deceived our first parents, was either *Christ* himself, or *Sophia*, concealed under the form of a serpent: and this opinion, is said to have induced them to keep some sacred serpents, and to pay them a species of honour. Into such absurdities men might easily fall, if they believed the Creator of the world to be a different being from the supreme God, and regarded as divine whatever was opposed to the pleasure of *Demiurgus*.(25)

W. F. Walch, Hist. der Ketz., vol. i., p. 607; who doubts whether it were not altogether an imaginary sect.—Tr.]

(23) [The *Sethites* are mentioned by the author of *Prædestinatus*, cap. 19, and *Philastrius*, de Haeres., cap. 3. But *Rhenferd*, (Diss. de Sethianis, in his Opp. philolog., p. 165); and *Zorn*, (Opuscul. sacra, tom. i., p. 614), consider this to be an imaginary sect. See C. W. F. Walch, loc. cit., p. 609, &c., and A. Neander, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 758, &c.—Tr.]

(24) [*Florinus* and *Blastus* were by the ancients, reckoned among the *Valentinians*. Both were presbyters of Rome, intimate friends, and excommunicated by the Roman bishop *Eleutherius*. (*Euseb.*, H. E., v. 15.) As *Florinus* in early life enjoyed the instruction of *Polycarp* at Smyrna, and as *Irenæus* wrote a letter to *Blastus*, concerning the schism at Rome about Easter day; C. W. F. Walch, (loc. cit., p. 404), supposes they both, and particularly *Blastus*, were opposed to the views of the Romish church respecting Easter. He also considers it most probable, that *Florinus* was inclined towards Gnosticism; for *Irenæus* wrote a book against him, concerning the eight Aeons; and he actually had some followers.—*Schl.* That *Florinus* was a Gnostic, is clear from *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. v., c. 20. That *Blastus* was so, is not so certain.—Tr.]

(25) The history and doctrines of this

sect, so far as they are known, I have stated in a German work, printed at Helmstadt, 1746, 4to, [bearing the title: Erster Versuch einer unpartheyischen und gründlichen Ketzergeschichte. Afterwards, J. H. Schumacher published an Explanation of the obscure and difficult Doctrinal Table of the ancient Ophites; Wolfenbüttel, 1756, 4to.—Schumacher maintained, that the doctrine of the Ophites embraced neither metaphysics nor theology, but merely the history of the Jewish nation couched in hieroglyphics.—C. W. F. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 447-481, has epitomized both works; and we here give his leading thoughts, in further illustration of this sect.—These people, called in Gr. *Ophites*, in Latin *Serpentians*, were by the Asiatics called *Nahassians* or *Naassians*. *Irenæus*, (l. ii., c. 34); the author of the supplement to *Tertullian's* book, de Præscript. hæret., (c. 47); *Epiphanius*, (Haer. xxxvii.); *Theodoret*, (Hæret. Fabul., l. i., c. 14); and *Augustine*, (de Haeres., c. 17); account them *Christian* heretics. But *Origen*, (contra Celsum, l. vii., § 28), holds them to be not Christians. Yet he speaks of them as pretended Christians, in his Comment. on Matth., tom. iii., p. 851, &c.—*Philastrius* makes them more ancient than Christianity. It is most probable, they were Jewish Gnostics, and that some of them embraced Christianity; so that the sect became divided into *Jewish* and *Christian*

§ 20. The numerous evils and discords, which arose from combining the Oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the Christian religion, began to be increased about the middle of this century, by those who brought the Grecian philosophy with them into the Christian church. As the doctrines held by the Christians respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and respecting the twofold nature of the Saviour, were least of all at agreement with the precepts of this philosophy, they first endeavoured so to explain these doctrines, that they could be comprehended by reason. This was attempted by one *Praxeas*, a very distinguished man and a confessor, at Rome. Discarding all real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he taught that the whole Father of all things joined himself to the human nature of *Christ*. Hence the followers were called *Monarchians* and *Patripassians*. Nor was the latter an unsuitable name for them, if *Tertullian* correctly understood their sentiments. For they denominated the *man* Christ, the *Son* of God; and held that to this Son, the *Father* of the universe or God so joined himself, as to be crucified and endure pangs along with the Son. Yet *Praxeas* does not appear to have erected a distinct church. (26)

§ 21. Nearly allied to this opinion, was that which was advanced about the same time at Rome, by *Theodotus*, a tanner, yet a man of learning

Ophites. There are two sources of information on this part of ecclesiastical history. The *first* is, the accounts of *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, and others. The *second* is, what *Origen* tells us (contra Celsum, lib. vi., § 33, &c.) concerning the *Diagram* of the Ophites. This *Diagram* was a tablet, on which the Ophites depicted their doctrines, in all sorts of figures with words annexed. It probably contained the doctrines of the Jewish Ophites; and is dark and unintelligible, unless we may suppose this symbolical representation contained that system, the principal doctrines of which are stated by the ancients. The theological system both of the Jewish and the Christian Ophites, cannot be epitomized, and must be sought for in *Walch*, p. 461.—Their serpent-worship consisted in this; they kept a living serpent, which they let out upon the dish, when celebrating the Lord's supper, to crawl around and over the bread. The priest to whom the serpent belonged, now came near, brake the bread, and distributed it to those present. When each had eaten his morsel, he kissed the serpent, which was afterwards confined. When this solemn act, which the Ophites called their perfect sacrifice, was ended, the meeting closed with a hymn of praise to the supreme God, whom the serpent in paradise had made known to men. But all the Ophites did not observe these rites, which were peculiar to the Christian Ophites, and confined to a small number among them. This worship must have been symbolic. The Ophites had also *Talismans*.—*Schl.* See a lucid account of the Ophites, in *A.*

Neander's Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. ii., p. 746-756.—*Tr.*]

(26) See *Tertullian*, Liber contra Praxeam; and compare *Peter Wesseling*, Probabilia, cap. 26, p. 223, &c. ["*Tertullian* (to whom we are indebted for all certain knowledge of the views of *Praxeas*), was not only an obscure writer, but also a prejudiced one in regard to *Praxeas*. He not only rejected his doctrine, but hated him; because *Praxeas* had alienated the Roman bishop *Victor* from *Montanus*, whose partisan *Tertullian* was. Hence *Tertullian*, in his censures on *Praxeas*, is often extravagant and insulting. The opposition of *Praxeas* to *Montanus*, doubtless led the former into his error. *Montanus* had treated of the doctrine of three persons in the divine essence, and had insisted on a real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (*Tertullian* contra Praxeam, c. 13, p. 644.) *Praxeas*, who was hostile to *Montanus*, published his own doctrine in opposition to *Montanus*. From *Tertullian*, moreover, it appears clearly, that *Praxeas* discarded the distinction of persons in the divine essence; and, as *Tertullian* expresses it, contended for the *monarchy* of God. But how he explained what the Scriptures teach, concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, is not so clear. Of the various conceptions we might gather from *Tertullian*, *Mosheim* gives a full investigation, in his Comment. de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 426. See also *C. W. F. Walch*, Hist. der Ketzerereyen, vol. i., p. 537-546."—*Schl.* See also *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. iii., p. 994, &c.—*Tr.*]

and a philosopher; and by one *Artemas* or *Artemon*, from whom originated the *Artemonites*. For, so far as can be gathered from not very distinct accounts of these men left us by the ancients, they supposed, that when the *man Christ* was born, a certain *divine energy* or some portion of the divine nature (and not the *person* of the Father, as *Praxeas* imagined) united itself to him. Which of these men preceded the other in time; and whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed from each other; cannot at this day be decided, so few and obscure are the ancient accounts we have of them. But this is unquestionable, the disciples of both applied philosophy and geometry to the explication of the Christian doctrine. (27)

§ 22. The same attachment to philosophy induced *Hermogenes*, a painter, to depart from the sentiments of Christians, respecting the origin of the world and the nature of the soul, and to cause disturbance in a part of the Christian community. Regarding *matter* as the source of all evil, he could not believe, that God had brought it into existence by his omnipotent volition. He therefore held, that the world and whatever is in the world, and also souls and spirits, were formed by the Deity out of *eternal* and vicious matter. There is much in this doctrine very difficult to be explained, and not in accordance with the common opinions of Christians. But neither *Tertullian* who wrote against him, nor others of the ancients, inform us how he explained those Christian doctrines which are repugnant to his opinions. (28)

(27) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. v., c. 28. *Epiphanius*, Hæres. liv., p. 464. *P. Wesseling*, Probabilia, c. 21, p. 172, &c. [Several persons occur in the history of the heretics, bearing the name of *Theodotus*. (1) *Theodotus of Byzantium*, a tanner; of whom above. (2) *Theodotus the younger*, disciple of the former, and founder of the sect of Melchizedekians. This sect derived its name from its holding, agreeably to the doctrine of the elder *Theodotus*, that *Melchizedek* was the power of God, and superior to *Christ*; and that he sustained the office of an Intercessor for the angels in heaven, as *Christ* did for us men on earth. (3) *Theodotus, the Valentinian*. (4) *Theodotus, the Montanist*.—Our *Theodotus* had saved his life, during a persecution at Byzantium, by a denial of *Christ*; and thus had incurred general contempt. To escape from disgrace, he went to Rome. But there his offence became known. To extenuate his fault, he gave out that he regarded Jesus Christ as a mere man, and that it could be no great crime to deny a mere man. He was therefore excluded from the church, by *Victor* the bishop. Thus *Theodotus* came near to the system of the *Socinians*, and held *Christ* for a mere man, though a virtuous and upright one. Whether he held the birth of Christ to have been natural or supernatural, the ancient accounts are not agreed. He rejected the Gospel of *John*; and held his own doctrine to be apostolical, and that of

the eternal divinity of Christ to be a novel doctrine. See *C. W. F. Walch*, loc. cit., p. 546–557.—*Artemon* has, in modern times, become more famous than *Theodotus*; since *Samuel Crell* assumed the name of an *Artemonite*, in order to distinguish himself from the odious Socinians, whose doctrines he did not fully approve. (See his book, with the title: *L. M. Artemonii Initium Evangelii Johannis ex antiquitate restitutum*; and his other writings.) The history of this *Artemon* is very obscure. The time when he lived cannot be definitely ascertained; and the history of his doctrine is not without difficulties. It is not doubted that he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ, as held by orthodox Christians. But whether he swerved towards the system of the modern Socinians, or to that of *Praxeas*, is another question. *Dr. Mosheim* believed the latter; de Rebus Christ., &c., 491. But, as this rests on the too recent testimony of *Gennadius* of Marseilles, (de Dogm. Eccles., c. 3), *Dr. Walch* (p. 564) calls it in question. See also *Jo. Erh. Rappen*, Diss. de hist. Artemonis et Artemonitarum, Lips., 1737.—*Schl.* See also *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., part iii., p. 996–1000.—*Tr.*]

(28) There is extant a tract of *Tertullian*, Liber contra Hermogenem, in which he assails the doctrine of *Hermogenes* concerning matter and the origin of the world. But another tract of his, de Censu animæ, in which he confuted the opinion of *Hermogenes* con-

§ 23. In addition to these sects which may be called the daughters of philosophy, there arose in the reign of *Marcus Antoninus*, an illiterate sect, opposed to all learning and philosophy. An obscure man of weak judgment, named *Montanus*, who lived in a poor village of Phrygia called Pepuza, had the folly to suppose himself the *Comforter* promised by *Christ* to his disciples, and to pretend to utter prophecies under divine inspiration. (29) He indeed attempted no change in the doctrines of religion; but he professed to be divinely commissioned to perfect and give efficiency to the moral discipline taught by *Christ* and his apostles: for he supposed that *Christ* and his apostles had yielded up many points to the weakness of the people of their age, and thus had given only an incomplete and imperfect rule of life. He therefore would have fasts multiplied and extended, forbid second marriages as illicit, did not allow churches to grant absolution to such as had fallen into the greater sins, condemned all decoration of the body and all female ornaments, required polite learning and philosophy to be banished from the church, ordered virgins to be veiled, and maintained that Christians sin most grievously, by rescuing their lives by flight or redeeming them with money in time of persecution. I pass by some other of his austere and rigid precepts.

§ 24. A man who professed to be a holier moralist than *Christ* himself, and who would obtrude his severe precepts upon Christians for divine commands and oracles, could not be endured in the Christian church. Besides, his dismal predictions of the speedy downfall of the Roman republic, &c., might bring the Christian community into imminent danger. He was therefore, first by the decisions of some councils and afterwards by that of the whole church, excluded from all connexion with that body. But the severity of his discipline itself led many persons of no mean condition, to put confidence in him. Pre-eminent among these, were two

cerning the soul, is lost. [*Tertullian* is exceedingly severe upon *Hermogenes*, who was probably his contemporary, and fellow African. Yet he allows that he was an ingenious and eloquent man, and sound in the principal doctrines of Christianity. It seems, the morals of *Hermogenes* gave most offence to *Tertullian*. He had married repeatedly, and he painted for all customers what they wished. To a Montanist these things were exceedingly criminal. There is no evidence that *Hermogenes* founded a sect.—See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 432, &c. *C. W. F. Wulch*, Hist. der Ketz., vol. i., p. 476, &c., and *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., part iii., p. 976, &c.—Tr.]

(29) They doubtless err, who tell us that *Montanus* claimed to be the Holy Spirit. He was not so foolish. Nor do those correctly understand his views, whom I have heretofore followed, and who represent him as asserting, that there was divinely imparted to him, that very Holy Spirit or Comforter, who once inspired and animated the apostles. *Montanus* distinguished the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ* to the apostles, from the Holy Spirit that was poured upon

them; and held, that under the name of the *Paraclete*, *Christ* indicated a divine teacher, who would supply certain parts of the religious system which were omitted by the Saviour, and explain more clearly certain other parts which for wise reasons had been less perfectly taught. Nor was *Montanus* alone in making this distinction. For other Christian doctors supposed the *Paraclete*, whose coming *Christ* had promised, was a divine messenger to men, and different from the Holy Spirit given to the apostles. In the third century, *Manes* interpreted the promise of *Christ* concerning the *Paraclete* in the same manner; and boasted that he himself was that *Paraclete*. And who does not know, that *Mohammed* had the same views, and applied the words of *Christ* respecting the *Paraclete* to himself? *Montanus*, therefore, wished to be regarded as the *Paraclete* of *Christ*, and not as the Holy Spirit. The more carefully and attentively we read *Tertullian*, the greatest of all *Montanus'* disciples, and the best acquainted with his system, the more clearly will it appear that such were his views.

opulent ladies, *Priscilla* and *Maximilla*; who themselves, with others, uttered prophecies, after the example of their master, whom they denominated the *Paraclete* or *Comforter*. Hence it was easy for *Montanus* to found a new church, which was first established at *Pepuza*, a little town of Phrygia, but which spread in process of time through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. Of all his followers, the most learned and distinguished was *Tertullian*, a man of genius, but austere and gloomy by nature; who defended the cause of his preceptor, by many energetic and severe publications. (30)

(30) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., cap. 16, and especially *Tertullian*, in his numerous books; and then all the writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated professedly of the sects of the early ages. Quite recently, and with attention and great erudition, the history of the Montanists has been illustrated by *Theoph. Wernsdorf*, in his *Commentatio de Montanistis sæculi secundi vulgo creditis hæreticis*, Dantzic, 1751, 4to.—[The Montanists were also called *Phrygians*, or *Cataphrygians*, from the country where they resided and originated; also *Pepuzians*, from the town where *Montanus* had his habitation, and which he pretended was the *New Jerusalem* spoken of in the Revelation of St. John. It appears likewise, that, from *Priscilla* they were called *Priscillianists*; though this name, on account of its ambiguity, has in modern times been disused. *Tertullian* denominated those of his faith, the *Spiritual*, (*Spirituales*); and its opposers, the *Carnal*, (*Psychikoi*); because the former admitted *Montanus'* inspirations of the Holy Spirit, which the latter rejected.—The time when *Montanus* began to disturb the church, is much debated. Those who follow *Eusebius*, who is most to be relied upon, place this movement in the year 171, or 172. *Wernsdorf's* conjecture that *Montanus* was

the Bishop of *Pepuza*, is not improbable. He and *Priscilla* and *Maximilla* pretended to have divine revelations, which the *Comforter* imparted to them, in order to supply by them what further instruction the Christian church needed. The instruction, said they, which the Holy Spirit gives to men, is progressive. In the Old Testament, instruction was in its infancy. *Christ* and his apostles advanced it to its youthful stature. By *Montanus* and his coadjutors, it is brought to its perfect manhood. In the Old Testament God conceded much to the hardness of the people's hearts, and *Christ* was indulgent to the weakness of the flesh, but the *Comforter* is unsparing to both, and presents the virtues of Christians in their full splendour.—Their revelations related to no new doctrines of faith, but only to rules of practice. Some of them also were historical. But all these revelations seem to have been the effect of their melancholy temperament, and of an excessively active imagination.—See, concerning *Tertullian*, *Hamberger's* account of the principal writers, vol. ii., p. 492, and *J. G. Walch*, Hist. Eccles. N. Test., p. 648, &c., and concerning the *Montanists*, *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 611, &c.—*Schl.* Also *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. iii., p. 870–893.—*Tr.*]

CENTURY THIRD.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Rights and Immunities of Christians enlarged.—§ 2. Under various Emperors. Goodwill of Alexander towards Christ.—§ 3. Other Emperors favourable to the Christians. The Religion of the Emperor Philip.—§ 4. The Number of Christians augmented: from Causes, partly Divine,—§ 5. and, partly human.—§ 6. Countries added to the Kingdom of Christ.—§ 7. State of the Church in France, Germany.

§ 1. THAT Christians suffered very great evils in this century, and were in perfect security during no part of it, admits of no controversy. For, not to mention the popular tumults raised against them by the pagan priests, the governors and magistrates could persecute them, without violating the existing imperial laws, as often as either superstition or avarice or cruelty prompted. Yet it is no less certain, that the rights and liberties of the Christians were increased, more than many have supposed. In the army, in the court, and among all ranks, there were many Christians whom no one molested at all; and under most of the Roman emperors who reigned in this century, Christianity presented no obstacle to the attainment of public stations and honours. In many places also, with the full knowledge of the emperors and magistrates, they had certain houses in which they regularly assembled for the worship of God. Yet it is probable, or rather is more than probable, that the Christians commonly purchased this security and these liberties with money; notwithstanding some of the emperors had very kind feelings towards them, and were not greatly opposed to their religion.

§ 2. *Antoninus*, surnamed *Caracalla*, the son of *Severus*, came to the throne in the year 211; and during the six years of his reign, he neither oppressed the Christians himself, nor suffered others to oppress them.(1) *Antoninus Heliogabalus*, [A.D. 218–222], though of a most abandoned moral character, had no hostility towards the Christians.(2) His succe-

(1) [From a passage in *Tertullian*, (ad Scapul., cap. 4), asserting that *Caracalla* had a Christian nurse: lacte Christiano educatum fuisse; and from one in *Spartinus*, (life of *Caracalla*, in *Scriptor. Histor. Aug.*, vol. i., p. 707, cap. 1), asserting that he was much attached to a Jewish playfellow, when he was seven years old; it has been inferred

that he was half a Christian, and on that account was indulgent to the followers of *Christ*. But it is much more probable, that they purchased his indulgence with their gold. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 460.—Tr.]

(2) *Lampridius*, vita *Heliogabali*, cap. 3, p. 796. [Dicebat praeterea (Imperator) Ju-

sor, *Alexander Severus*, [A.D. 222-235], an excellent prince, did not indeed repeal the laws which had been enacted against the Christians, so that instances occur of Christians' suffering death in his reign; yet from the influence of his mother, *Julia Mamaea*, to whom he was greatly attached, he showed kind feelings towards them in various ways, whenever occasion was offered, and even paid some worship and honour to our Saviour.(3) For *Julia* entertained the most favourable sentiments of the Christian religion; and at one time invited to the court, *Origen*, the celebrated Christian doctor, that she might hear him discourse. But those who conclude that *Julia* and *Alexander* actually embraced Christianity, have not testimony to adduce, which is unexceptionable. Yet it is certain, that *Alexander* thought the Christian religion deserved toleration, beyond others; and regarded its author as worthy to be ranked among the extraordinary men who were divinely moved.(4)

§ 3. Under *Gordian* [A.D. 238-244], the Christians lived unmolested and tranquil. His successors, the *Philips*, father and son, [A.D. 244-249], showed themselves so friendly to the Christians, that by many, they were supposed to be Christians. And there are some arguments which might render it probable, that these emperors did, though secretly and covertly, embrace Christianity. But as these arguments are balanced by others equally strong and imposing, the question respecting the religion of *Philip* the Arabian, and his son, which has exercised the sagacity of so many learned men, must be left undecided.(5) At least, neither party has adduced any evidence, either from testimony or from facts, which was too strong to be invalidated. Among the subsequent emperors of this century, *Gallienus*, [A.D. 260-268], and some others likewise, if they did not directly favour the Christian cause, they at least did not retard it.

§ 4. This friendship of great men, and especially of emperors, was undoubtedly not the least among the human causes, which contributed to enlarge the boundaries of the church. But other causes, and some of them

daeorum et Samaritanorum religiones et Christianam devotionem illuc (Romam) transferendam, ut omnium cultarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret: which *Dr. Moshcim*, (de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 460), understands to mean, that *Heliogabalus* wished the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian religions to be freely tolerated at Rome, so that the priests of his order might understand all the arcana of them, having them daily before their eyes.—*Tr.*]

(3) See *Lampridius*, de Vita Severi, c. 29, p. 930, and *Car. Hen. Zeibich*, Diss. de Christo ab Alexandro in larario culto; which is found in the *Miscell. Lips. novae*, tom. iii., p. 42, &c. [Most of the modern writers make *Julia Mamaea* to have been a Christian. See *J. R. Wetstein's* preface to *Origen's Dial. contra Marcionitas*. But the ancient writers, *Eusebius*, (H. E., vi., 21), and *Jerome*, (de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 54), express themselves dubiously. The former calls her *θεοσεβestrήνην*, and the latter *religiosam*, (*devout*); and both state that she invited *Origen* to her court, then at Antioch, in order

to hear him discourse on religion. But neither of them intimates, that she obeyed his precepts and adopted the Christian faith. And in the life of *Julia*, there are clear indications of superstition, and of reverence for the pagan gods.—*Schl.* from *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 461.]

(4) See *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de Lucii Britonum regis, Juliae Mamaeae, et Philipporum conversionibus, Opp., tom. ii., p. 400. *P. E. Jablonski*, Diss. de Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato, in *Miscellan. Lips. nov.*, tom. iv., p. 56, &c.

(5) See *Spanheim*, de Christianismo Philipporum, Opp., tom. ii., p. 400. (*P. de la Faye*, Entretiens historiques sur la Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe, Utrecht, 1692, 12mo. *Mammachius*, Origines et Antiq. Christianae, tom. ii, p. 252, &c. See *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux Evangelii toti orbi exorientis, p. 252, &c., [and *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 471.—The most important ancient testimonies, are *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 34, and *Chronicon*, ann. 246. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 54.—*Tr.*]

divine, must be added. Among the *divine* causes, besides the inherent energy of heavenly truth and the piety and constancy of the Christian teachers, conspicuous is that extraordinary providence of God, which, as we are informed, by means of dreams and visions, excited many persons who before were either thoughtless or alienated from Christianity, to come out at once and enrol their names among the followers of *Christ*.(6) To this must be added, the curing of diseases and other miracles which very many Christians still performed, by invoking the name of the Saviour.(7) Yet the number of miracles was less in this age than in the preceding; which may be ascribed not only to the wisdom of God, but also to his justice, which would not suffer men to make gain by the powers divinely given them.(8)

§ 5. Among the *human* causes which aided the progress of Christianity, may doubtless be reckoned the translation of the Scriptures into various languages, the labours of *Origen* in disseminating copies of them, and the various books composed by wise men. No less efficacy is to be ascribed to the beneficence of Christians, even towards those whose religion they abhorred. The idolaters must have had hearts of stone, not to have been softened and brought to have more friendly feelings towards the people, whose great sympathy for the poor, kindness to enemies, care of the sick, readiness to redeem captives, and numerous other kind offices, proved them to be deserving of the love and gratitude of mankind. If, what I would not pertinaciously deny, pious frauds and impositions deserve a place among the causes of the extension of Christianity, they doubtless hold the lowest place, and were employed only by a few.

§ 6. That the boundaries of the church were extended, in this century, no one calls in question; but in what manner, by whom, and in what countries, is not equally manifest. *Origen* taught the religion he professed to a tribe of Arabs: I suppose, they were some of the wandering Arabs, who live in tents.(9) The Goths, a ferocious and warlike people, that inhabited Moesia and Thrace, and made perpetual incursions into the neighbouring provinces; received a knowledge of *Christ* from certain Christian priests whom they carried away from Asia. As those priests, by the sanctity of their lives, and their miracles, acquired respectability and great influence among these marauders, who were entirely illiterate; such a change was produced among them, that a great part of the nation professed Christianity, and in some measure laid aside their savage manners.(10)

(6) See *Origen*, adv. Celsum, lib. i., p. 35. Homil. in Lucæ vii. Opp., tom. ii., p. 216, ed. Basil. *Tertullian*, de Anima, cap. 14, p. 348, ed. Rigaltii. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., c. 5, and others. [See also, note (14) on cent. ii., pt. i., ch. i., p. 102, &c., of this work.—Tr.]

(7) *Origen*, adv. Celsum, l. i., p. 5, 7. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. v., c. 7. *Cyprian*, Ep. i. ad Donatum, p. 3, and the note of S. Baluze, there, p. 376.

(8) *W. Spencer*, Notes on *Origen* adv. Celsum, p. 6, 7.

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., cap. 19. [But *Semler*, Hist. Eccl. selecta cap., vol. i., p. 59, supposes they were not wandering Arabs.—Tr.]

(10) *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., c. 6. *Paul Diaconus*, Hist. Miscellan., l. ii., c. 14. *Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., c. 5. [*Philostorgius* says, that *Ulphilas*, who in the fourth century translated the Christian Scriptures into the Gothic language, was a descendant of the captives carried off by the Goths from Cappadocia, in the reign of *Gallicienus*; which is not improbable. By the influence of their Christian captives, the Goths were induced to invite Christian teachers among them; and numerous churches were collected. A Gothic bishop, named *Theophilus*, subscribed the Acts of the council of Nice, (*Soerates*, Hist. Eccl., ii., c. 41). Yet there is indubitable evidence, that a large part of the nation remained pagans, long after

§ 7. To the few and small Christian churches in France, erected by certain Asiatic teachers in the second century, more and larger ones were added in this century, from the times of *Decius*, [A.D. 249]. For it was in the reign of this emperor, those seven devout men, *Dionysius*, *Gratian*, *Trophimus*, *Paul*, *Saturninus*, *Martial*, and *Stremonius*, migrated to this country; and amid various perils founded the churches of *Paris*, *Tours*, *Arles*, [*Narbonne*, *Toulouse*, *Limoges*, *Clermont*], and other places. And their disciples gradually spread the Christian doctrine throughout Gaul. (11) To this age, likewise, must be referred the origin of the German churches, of *Cologne*, *Treves*, *Metz*, [*Tongres*, *Liege*], and others; the fathers of which were *Eucharis*, *Valerius*, *Maternus*, *Clement*, and others. (12) The Scotch also say, that their country was enlightened with the light of Christianity in this century; which does not appear improbable in itself, but cannot be put beyond controversy by any certain testimony. (13)

CHAPTER II.

THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The Persecution of *Severus*.—§ 2. Of *Maximinus*, the Thracian.—§ 3. The Cruelty of *Decius* led many Christians to deny Christ.—§ 4. Controversies in the Church on this Subject, *Libelli Pacis*.—§ 5. Persecutions of *Gallus* and *Volusian*.—§ 6. Of *Valerian*.—§ 7. State of the Church under *Gallienus*, *Claudius*, and *Aurelian*.—§ 8. Attempts of the Philosophers against the Christians.—§ 9. Comparisons of some Philosophers with Christ.—§ 10. Injury thence arising.—§ 11. Attempts of the Jews against the Christians.

§ 1. In the commencement of this century, the Christians were variously afflicted in many of the Roman provinces; but their calamity was increased in the year 203, when the emperor *Severus*, who was otherwise not hostile to them, enacted a law that no person should abandon the religion of his fathers, for that of the Christians, or even for that of the Jews. (1) Although this law did not condemn the [existing] Christians, but merely restrained the propagation of their religion, yet it afforded to rapacious and unjust governors and judges great opportunity for troubling the Christians, and for putting many of the poor to death, in order to induce the rich to avert their danger by donations. Hence, after the passing of this law, very many Christians in Egypt, and in other parts of both Asia and Africa, were cruelly slain; and among them were *Leonidas*, the father of *Origen*; the two celebrated African ladies, *Perpetua* and *Felici-*

this period. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 449.—*Tr.*]

(11) *Gregory Turonens.*, *Historia Francor.*, lib. i., c. 28, p. 23. *Theod. Ruinart*, *Acta Martyrum sincera*, p. 109, &c. [See note (9), on cent. ii., part i., ch. i., p. 100 of this work; where the origin of the Gallic or French churches, is considered, at some length.—*Tr.*]

(12) *Aug. Calmet*, *Histoire de Lorraine*,

tome i., Diss. i., p. 7, &c. *Jo. Nicol. de Honthem*, *Historia Trevirensis*. [See also notes (6) and (7) on cent. ii., part i., ch. i., p. 99 of this work.—*Tr.*]

(13) See *Usher* and *Stillingfleet*, on the Origin and Antiquities of the British churches; and *Geo. Mackenzie*, de Regali Scottorum prosapia, cap. viii., p. 119, &c.

(1) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. vi., c. i. *Spartianus*, *Vita Severi*, cap. 16, 17.

tas, whose Acts [martyrdom] have come down to us ; (2) also *Potamiena*, a virgin ; *Marcella*, and others of both sexes, whose names were held in high honour in the subsequent ages.

§ 2. From the death of [*Septimius*] *Severus*, till the reign of *Maximin*, called *Thrax*, from the country which gave him birth, [or, from A.D. 211 to A.D. 235], the condition of Christians was everywhere tolerable, and in some places prosperous. But *Maximin*, who had slain *Alexander Severus*, an emperor peculiarly friendly to the Christians, fearing lest the Christians should avenge the death of their patron, ordered their bishops, and particularly those that he knew had been the friends and intimates of *Alexander*, to be seized and put to death. (3) During his reign, therefore, many and atrocious injuries were brought upon the Christians. For although the edict of the tyrant related only to the bishops and the ministers of religion, yet its influence reached farther, and incited the pagan priests, the populace, and the magistrates to assail Christians of all orders. (4)

§ 3. This storm was followed by many years of peace and tranquillity. [From A.D. 237–249.] But when *Decius Trajan* came to the imperial throne, A.D. 249, war in all its horrors, again burst upon the Christians. For this emperor, excited either by fear of the Christians, or by attachment to the ancient superstition, published terrible edicts, by which the governors were commanded, on pain of forfeiting their own lives, either to exterminate all Christians utterly, or bring them back by pains and tortures to the religion of their fathers. During the two succeeding years, a great multitude of Christians, in all the Roman provinces, were cut off by various species of punishment and suffering. (5) This persecution was more cruel and terrific than any that preceded it ; and immense numbers, dismayed, not so much by the fear of death, as by the dread of the long-continued tortures by which the magistrates endeavoured to overcome the constancy of Christians, professed to renounce *Christ* ; and procured for themselves safety, either by sacrificing, i. e., offering incense before the idols, or by certificates purchased with money. And hence arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificers*, *Incensers*, and the *Certificated*, (*Sacrificatores*, *Thurificatores*, and *Libellatici*), names by which the lapsed were designated. (6)

(2) *Theod. Ruinart*, *Acta martyrum sin-cera*, p. 90, &c. [See an affecting account of the sufferings of these and other martyrs, in the reign of *Severus*, in *Milner's* Hist. of the Church, cent. iii., ch. v., p. 231, &c., ed. Boston, 1822.—*Tr.*]

(3) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., c. 28. *Orosius*, Hist. lib. vii., c. 19, p. 509.

(4) *Origen*, tom. xxviii. in *Matth.*, Opp., tom. i., p. 137. *Firmilian*, in Opp. *Cypriani*, ep. 75, p. 140, &c.

(5) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., c. 39–41. *Gregory Nyssen*, *Vita Thaumaturgi*, Opp., tom. iii., p. 568, &c. *Cyprian*, de *Lapsis*, in Opp., p. 182, &c. [*Eusebius* attributes the persecution by *Decius*, to his hatred of *Philip*, his predecessor, whom he had murdered, and who was friendly to the Christians. *Gregory* attributes it to the emperor's zeal for idolatry. Both causes

might have prompted him.—The persecuting *Edict* is not now extant ; that which was published by *Medon*, Toulouse, 1664, 4to, is probably unauthentic. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 476, &c.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *Prudentius Maran*, *Life of Cyprian*, prefixed to *Cypriani* Opp., § vi., p. 54, &c. [For an interesting account of the sufferings of Christians in this persecution, the English reader is referred to *Milner's* Hist. of the Church, cent. iii., ch. 8, p. 257, and ch. 11, p. 293, ed. Boston, 1822, vol. i.—This persecution was more terrible than any preceding one, because it extended over the whole empire, and because its object was to worry the Christians into apostasy by extreme and persevering torture.—The *Certificated*, or *Libellatici*, are supposed to be, such as purchased *certificates* from the corrupt magistrates, in which it was declared,

§ 4. From the multitude of Christians chargeable with defection in the reign of *Decius*, great commotions and sharp contests arose in different parts of the church. For the lapsed wished to be restored to Christian fellowship, without submitting to that severe *penitence* which the laws of the church prescribed; and some of the bishops favoured their wishes, while others opposed them.(7) In Egypt and Africa, many persons, to obtain more ready pardon of their offences, resorted to the intercession of the *martyrs*, and obtained from them *letters of recommendation*, (*libellos pacis*), that is, papers in which the dying martyrs declared, that *they* considered the persons worthy of their communion, and wished them to be received and treated as brethren. Some bishops and presbyters were too ready to admit offenders, who produced such letters. But *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, a decided and strenuous man, though he was not disposed to derogate at all from the honour of the martyrs, was nevertheless opposed to this excessive lenity, and wished to limit the effects of these *letters of recommendation*. Hence there arose a sharp contest between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, the lapsed, and the people, which ended in his gaining the victory.(8)

§ 5. The successors of *Decius*, namely, *Gallus* and his son *Volusian*, [A.D. 251–253], renewed the persecution against the Christians, which seemed to be subsiding:(9) and, as their edicts were accompanied by public calamities, particularly by a pestilential disease which spread through many provinces, the Christians had again to undergo much suffering in divers countries.(10) For the pagan priests persuaded the populace, that the gods visited the people with so many calamities, on account

that they were pagans, and had complied with the demands of the law, when neither of these was fact. To purchase such a certificate was not only to be partaker in the fraudulent transaction, but it was to prevaricate before the public in regard to Christianity, and was inconsistent with that open confession of *Christ* before men, which he himself requires. On the purport of these letters, see *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 482–489.—*Tr.*]

(7) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., c. 44. *Cyprian*, Epistolæ, passim.

(8) *Gab. Albaspinæus*, Observat. Eccles., lib. i., obs. xx., p. 94. *Jo. Dallæus*, de poenis et satisfactionibus humanis, l. vii., c. 16, p. 706. The whole history of this controversy must be gathered from the Epistles of *Cyprian*. [*Tertullian*, de Pudicitia, cap. 22, and, ad Martyres, cap. 1, makes the earliest mention of these letters: whence it is conjectured, that they first began to be used about the middle of the *second* century.—By *martyrs* here, must be understood, persons already under sentence of death for their religion, or at least, such as had endured some suffering, and were still in prison and uncertain what would befall them. In that age, when martyrs were almost idolized, and the doctrines of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, imperfectly understood; the propriety of

such letters was unquestioned, and their influence very great. Yet the abuses of them were felt by the more discerning. *Dr. Mosheim*, (de Rebus Christ., &c., p. 490–497), has collected the following facts, respecting their misuse. (1) They were given, with little or no discrimination, to all applicants. *Cyprian*, ep. 14, p. 24; ep. 10, p. 20.—(2) They often did not express definitely the names of the persons recommended, but said: “Receive A. B. (*cum suis*) and his friends.” *Ibid.*, ep. 10, p. 20, 21.—(3) Sometimes a martyr, before his death, commissioned some friend, to give letters in his name, to all applicants. *Ibid.*, ep. 21, p. 30; ep. 22, p. 31.—(4) Some presbyters obeyed these letters, without consulting the bishop, and thus subverted ecclesiastical order. *Ibid.*, ep. 27, p. 38; ep. 10, p. 20; ep. 40, p. 52; ep. 22, p. 31, 32. It is easy to see what effects would follow, when the almost deified martyrs, of every age and sex and condition, felt themselves to possess authority almost divine, and were besieged by a host of persons writhing under the rigours of the ancient discipline.—*Tr.*]

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., c. 1. *Cyprian*, ep. lvii., lviii.

(10) See *Cyprian*, Liber ad Demetrianum. [*Milner's* Hist. of the Church, cent. iii., ch. 12, p. 308.—*Tr.*]

of the Christians. The next emperor, *Valerian*, stilled the commotion, A.D. 254, and restored tranquillity to the church.

§ 6. Till the fifth year of his reign, *Valerian* was very kind to the Christians; but suddenly, in the year 257, by the persuasion of *Macrianus*, a most bigoted pagan who was his prime minister, he prohibited the Christians from holding meetings, and ordered the bishops and other teachers into exile. The next year he published a far more severe edict; so that no small number of Christians, in all the provinces of the Roman empire, were put to death, and often exposed to punishments worse than death. Eminent among the martyrs in this tempest, were *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, *Sixtus*, bishop of Rome, *Laurentius*, a deacon at Rome, who was roasted before a slow fire, and others. But *Valerian* being taken captive in a war against the Persians, his son *Gallienus*, in the year 260, restored peace to the church.(11)

§ 7. Under *Gallienus*, therefore, who reigned with his brother eight years, [A.D. 260–268], and under his successor *Claudius*, who reigned two years, [A.D. 268–270], the condition of the Christians was tolerable, yet not altogether tranquil and happy. Nor did *Aurelian*, who came to the throne A.D. 270, undertake to disquiet them, during four years. But in the fifth year of his reign, prompted either by his own superstition or by that of others, he prepared for war against them. But before his edicts had been published over the whole empire, he was assassinated in Thrace, A.D. 275.(12) Hence, few Christians were cut off under him. The remainder of this century, if we except some few instances of injustice, avarice, or superstition in the governors,(13) passed away, without any great troubles or injuries done to Christians living among Romans.

§ 8. While the emperors and provincial governors were assailing Christians with the sword and with edicts, the Platonic philosophers, before described, fought them with disputations, books, and stratagems. And the more was to be feared from them, because they approved and adopted many doctrines and institutions of the Christians, and, following the example of *Ammonius* their master, attempted to amalgamate the old religion and the new. At the head of them in this century, was *Porphyry*, a Syrian, or Tyrian; who composed a long work against the Christians, which was afterwards destroyed, in obedience to the imperial laws.(14) He was undoubtedly an acute, ingenious, and learned man, as his works which are extant evince; but he was not a formidable enemy to the Christians. For he had more imagination and superstition, than sound argument and judg-

(11) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., cap. 10, 11. *Acta Cypriani*, in Ruinart's *Acta martyrum sincera*, p. 216. *Cyprian*, epist. lxxvii., p. 178; epist. lxxxi., p. 165, ed. Baluz. [*Milner's* Hist. of the Chh., cent. iii., ch. xvi, vol. i., p. 347.—*Tr.*]

(12) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 30. *Lactantius*, de Mortibus persecutor. cap. 6.

(13) One example is, the iniquity of the Cæsar, *Galerius Maximian*, near the end of the century, who persecuted the soldiers and servants of his palace that professed Christianity. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., cap. 1 and 4.

(14) See *Lu. Holstein*, de Vita Porphyrii, cap. 11. *J. A. Fabricius*, Lux. Evang. toti orbi exorients, p. 154. *J. F. Buddæus*, Isaogoge in Theologiam, lib. ii., p. 877, &c., [and *Ja. Brucker's* Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 236, &c. His fifteen books against the Christians were condemned to be burned, by *Theodosius II.* and *Valentinian III.*, A.D. 449, (see the Codex Justin. de Summa Trinitate, l. i., tit. i., cap. 3.) The work was answered by *Methodius*, *Eusebius*, *Apollinaris*, and *Philostorgius*; but the answers are lost. Of the work of *Porphyry*, extracts are preserved by *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, and others.—*Tr.*]

ment; as his books that remain and the history of his life will show, without recurrence to the fragments of his work against the Christians, which are preserved and which are unworthy of a wise and upright man.

§ 9. Among the wiles and stratagems, by which this sect endeavoured to subvert the authority of the Christian religion, this deserves to be particularly mentioned, that they drew comparisons between the life, miracles, and transactions of our Saviour, and the history of the ancient philosophers; and endeavoured to persuade the unlearned and women, that these philosophers were in no respect inferior to *Christ*. With such views, *Archytas* of Tarentum, *Pythagoras*, and *Apollonius* Tyanaeus, a Pythagorean philosopher, were brought again upon the stage, and exhibited to the public dressed very much like *Christ* himself. The life of *Pythagoras* was written by *Porphry*. (15) The life of *Apollonius*, whose travels and prodigies were talked of by the vulgar, and who was a crafty mountebank, and the ape of *Pythagoras*, was composed by *Philostratus*, the first rhetorician of the age, in a style which is not inelegant. The reader of the work will readily perceive, that the philosopher is compared with our Saviour; and yet he will wonder, that any man of sound sense could have been deceived by the base falsehoods and fictions of the writer. (16)

10. But as nothing is so irrational as not to find some patrons among the weak and ignorant who regard words more than arguments, there were not a few who were ensnared by these silly attempts of the philosophers. Some were induced by these stratagems to abandon the Christian religion, which they had before embraced. Others, being told that there was little difference between the ancient religion, rightly explained and restored to its purity, and the religion which *Christ* really taught, not that corrupted form of it which his disciples professed; concluded it was best to remain among those who worshipped the [old] gods. Some were led by those comparisons of *Christ* with the ancient heroes and philosophers, to frame for themselves a kind of mixed or compound religion. Witness, among others, [the emperor] *Alexander Severus*; who esteemed *Christ*, and *Orpheus*, *Apollonius*, and the like, to be all worthy of equal honours.

§ 11. The *Jews* were reduced so low, that they could not, as formerly, excite in the magistrates any great hatred against the Christians. Yet they were not wholly inactive, as appears from the books written by *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* against them. There occur also in the Christian fathers several complaints of the hatred and the machinations of the *Jews*. (17) During the persecutions of *Severus*, one *Domnius* abandoned Christianity for Judaism; undoubtedly, to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the Christians. *Serapion* endeavoured to recall him to his duty,

(15) [And in the next century, by *Jamblichus*. That both biographers had the same object, is shown by *Lud. Küster*, Adnot. ad *Jamblich.*, cap. 2, p. 7, and cap. 19, p. 78.—*Schl.*]

(16) See *Godfr. Olcarius*, Praefat. ad *Philostrati vitam Apollonii*; and *Mosheim*, Notes on *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, p. 304, 309, 311, 834, [also *J. Brucker's Historia crit. philos.*, tom. ii., 98, &c., and *Enfield's Abridgment of Brucker*, vol. ii., p.

42, &c. *N. Lardner's Works*, vol. viii., p. 256–292.—*Apollonius* was born about the beginning, and died near the close of the first century. He travelled over all the countries from Spain to India; and drew much attention by his sagacious remarks, and by his pretensions to superhuman knowledge and powers. He was a man of genius, but vain-glorious and a great impostor.—*Tr.*]

(17) *Hippolytus*, Sermo in *Susann. et Daniel.*, Opp., tom. i., p. 274, 276.

by some epistles.(18) This example shows, that while the Christians were in trouble, the Jews were in safety : and therefore, though greatly depressed, they had not lost all power of doing injury to the Christians.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF LEARNING AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. Decay of Learning.—§ 2. State of Philosophy, especially the Platonic. Plotinus.—
 § 3. This Philosophy prevails everywhere.—§ 4. Different Sects of it.—§ 5. State of Learning among Christians.

§ 1. LITERATURE, which had suffered much in the preceding century, lost in this nearly all its glory. Among the Greeks, with the exception of *Dionysius Longinus*, an excellent rhetorician, *Dion Cassius*, a fine historian, and a few others, scarcely any writers appeared who can be recommended for their genius or their erudition. In the western provinces, still smaller was the number of men truly learned and eloquent, notwithstanding schools continued here and there devoted to the cultivation of genius. For very few of the emperors favoured learning ; civil wars kept the empire almost constantly in commotion ; and the perpetual incursions of the barbarous nations into the most cultivated provinces, extinguished with the public tranquillity even the thirst for knowledge.(1)

§ 2. As for the philosophers, about every sect of Grecian philosophy had some adherents that were not contemptible, and who are in part mentioned by *Longinus*.(2) But the school of *Ammonius*, the origin and dogmas of which have been already stated, gradually cast all others into the back ground. From Egypt it spread in a short time over nearly the whole Roman empire ; and drew after it almost all persons inclined to attend to metaphysical studies. This prosperity of the sect was owing especially to *Plotinus*, the most distinguished disciple of *Ammonius*, a man of intellectual acumen, and formed by nature for abstruse investigation. For he taught, first in Persia and afterwards at Rome and in Campania, to vast concourses of youth ; and embodied his precepts in various books, the greater part of which have come down to us.(3)

§ 3. It is almost incredible, what a number of pupils in a short time issued from the school of this man. But among them, no one is more cel-

(18) *Eusebius*, *Historia Eccles.*, lib. vi., cap. 12.

(1) See *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, par les Moines Benedictins, tom. i., part ii., p. 317, &c.

(2) In *Porphyry's* life of Plotinus, cap. 20, p. 128, ed. Fabricii.

(3) See *Porphyrii Vita Plotini*, republished by *J. A. Fabricius*, in *Biblioth. Græca*, vol. iv., p. 91. *Peter Boyle*, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii., art. Plotin, p. 757 ; and the learned *Ja. Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.*, tom. ii., p. 217, &c.

ebred than *Porphyry*, a Syrian; who spread over Sicily and many other countries, the system of his master, enlarged with new discoveries and sedulously polished.(4) At Alexandria, almost no other philosophy was publicly taught, from the times of *Ammonius* down to the sixth century. It was introduced into Greece by one *Plutarch*, who was educated at Alexandria, and who re-established the Academy at Athens, which subsequently embraced many very renowned philosophers who will hereafter be mentioned.(5)

§ 4. The character of this philosophy has already been explained, as far as was compatible with the brevity of this work. It is here proper to add, that all who were addicted to it, did not hold the same opinions, but differed from each other on several points. This diversity naturally arose from that principle, which the whole sect kept in sight; namely, that truth was to be pursued without restraint, and to be gleaned out of all systems. Hence the Alexandrian philosophers would sometimes receive, what those of Athens would reject. Yet there were certain leading doctrines, which were fundamental to the system, and which no one that claimed the name of a Platonist, dared to call in question. Such were the doctrines of one God, the source of all things, of the eternity of the world, of the dependance of matter on God, of the nature of the soul, of the plurality of Gods, of the method of explaining the popular superstitions, and some others.

§ 5. The estimation in which human learning should be held, was a question on which the Christians were about equally divided. For while many thought that the literature and writings of the Greeks ought to receive attention; there were others who contended, that true piety and religion were endangered by such studies. But gradually the friends of philosophy and literature acquired the ascendancy. To this issue *Origen* contributed very much; for having early imbibed the principles of the new Platonism, he inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole Christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated. Some also of the disciples of *Plotinus*, connected themselves with the Christians, yet retained the leading sentiments of their master:(6) and these undoubtedly laboured to disseminate their principles around them, and to instil them into the minds of the uninformed.

(4) *Lat. Holstenius*, Vita Porphyrii, republished by Fabricius, in Biblioth. Gr.—[“Porphyry was first the disciple of *Longinus*, author of the justly celebrated Treatise on the Sublime. But having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard *Plotinus*, he was so charmed with the genius and penetration

of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See *Plotin.*, Vit., p. 3. *Eunap.*, c. 2, p. 17.”—*Mael.*]

(5) *Marinus*, Vita Procli, cap. 11, 12, p. 25, &c.

(6) *Augustine*, Epistola lvi., ad Dioscor., Opp., tom. ii., p. 260.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Form of Church Government.—§ 2. What Rank the Bishop of Rome held in this Century.—§ 3. Gradual Progress towards a Hierarchy.—§ 4. The Vices of the Clergy.—§ 5. Hence the Inferior Orders of the Clergy.—§ 6. Marriage of the Clergy. Their Concubines.—§ 7. The principal Writers; Grecian and Oriental.—§ 8. Latin Writers.

§ 1. THE form of the ecclesiastical constitution and government which had been introduced, was more and more confirmed and strengthened, both as it related to individual churches and in regard to the whole religious community. He must be ignorant of the history and the monuments of this age, who can deny that a person bearing the title of *bishop* presided over each church in the larger cities, and that he managed its public concerns with some degree of authority; yet having the *presbyters* for his council, and taking the voice of the whole people on subjects of considerable moment.(1) It is equally certain, that one bishop in each province was pre-eminent over the rest in rank and in certain prerogatives. This was necessary for maintaining that consociation of churches, which had been introduced in the preceding century, and for the more convenient celebration of the councils. Yet it must be added, that the prerogatives of these principal bishops were not everywhere accurately ascertained; nor did the bishop of the chief city in a province, always hold the rank of first bishop. This also is beyond controversy, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, as presiding over the primitive and apostolic churches in the greater divisions of the empire, had precedence of all others, and were not only often consulted on weighty affairs, but likewise enjoyed certain prerogatives peculiar to themselves.

§ 2. As to the bishop of Rome in particular, he was regarded by *Cyprian*,(2) and doubtless by others likewise, as holding something of *primacy* in the church. But the fathers who with *Cyprian* ascribed this primacy to the Roman bishop, strenuously contended for the equality of all bishops, in respect to dignity and authority; and disregarding the judgment of the

(1) Authorities are cited by *David Blondell*, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronimi de episcopis et presbyteris*, p. 136, &c.—[and still more amply, by *James Boileau*, under the fictitious name of *Claudius Fontenius*, in his book de antiquo jure presbyterorum in regimine ecclesiastico, Turin, 1676, 12mo. The most valuable of these testimonies, are from the epistles of *Cyprian*, bishop of Carthage, who was a warm advocate for episcopal pre-eminence, yet did not presume to determine any question of moment by his own authority, or without the advice and consent of his presbyters, and was accustomed to take the sense of the whole church on subjects of peculiar interest. See *Cyprian*,

ep. v., p. 11; ep. xiii., p. 23; ep. xxviii., p. 39; ep. xxiv., p. 33; ep. xxvii., p. 37, 38.—To the objection, that *Cyprian* did himself ordain some presbyters and lectors, without the consent of his council and the laity, it is answered, that the persons so advanced were *confessors*, who, according to usage, were entitled to ordination without any previous election. *Cyprian*, ep. xxxiv., p. 46, 47; ep. xxxv., p. 48, 49. *Tertullian*, de Anima, c. 55, p. 353, &c.—See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 575–579.—Tr.]

(2) *Cyprian*, ep. lxxiii., p. 131; ep. lv., p. 86; de Unitate ecclesiæ, p. 195, ed. Baluze.

bishop of Rome, whenever it appeared to them incorrect, had no hesitation in following their own judgment. Of this *Cyprian* himself gave a striking example, in his famous controversy with *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, concerning the *baptism of heretics*. Whoever duly considers and compares all their declarations, will readily perceive that this *primacy* was not a primacy of *power* and authority, but only of precedence among associated brethren. That is, the primacy of the Romish bishop in regard to the whole church, was the same as that of *Cyprian* in the African church, which did not impair at all the equality of the African bishops, or curtail their liberties and rights, but merely conferred the right of convoking councils, of presiding in them, and admonishing his brethren fraternally, and the like.(3)

§ 3. Yet while the ancient mode of church government seemed in general to remain unaltered, there was a gradual deflection from its rules, and an approximation towards the form of a monarchy. For the bishops claimed much higher authority and power than before, and encroached more and more upon the rights not only of the brotherhood, but also of the presbyters. And to give plausibility to these usurpations, they advanced new doctrines concerning the church and the episcopal office; which however were so obscure for the most part, that it would seem they did not themselves understand them. The principal author of these innovations was *Cyprian*, the most bold and strenuous defender of episcopal power that had then arisen in the church. Yet he was not uniform and consistent, for in times of difficulty, when urged by necessity, he could give up his pretensions, and submit everything to the judgment and authority of the church.(4)

(3) See *Stephen Baluze*, Annot. ad *Cypriani Epist.*, p. 387, 389, 400, &c. And especially *Cyprian* himself, who contends strenuously for the perfect equality of all bishops.—Ep. lxxi., p. 127. [Nam nec Petrus—vindicaui sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit se *primum tenere*, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi oportere.]—Ep. lxxiii., p. 137. [Unusquisque Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem.]—Ep. lv., ad Cornelium Rom., p. 86. [Cum statutum—et equum sit pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiat, ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus.—*Cyprian's* address at the opening of the council of Carthage, A.D. 255, in his Works, p. 329, ed. Baluze. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat *omnis Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui *unus et solus* habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gu-

bernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi.—The passages referred to in the preceding note, in which *Cyprian* not very intelligibly speaks of a unity in the church and of a certain *primacy* of the Roman pontiff, must be so understood as not to contradict these very explicit assertions of the absolute equality of all bishops.—See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christ., &c., p. 579–587.—*Tr.*]

(4) [No man can speak in higher terms of the power of bishops, than the arrogant *Cyprian*—that very *Cyprian*, who, when not fired by any passion, is so condescending towards presbyters, deacons, and the common people. He inculcates, on all occasions, that bishops derive their office, not so much from their election by the clergy and people, as from the attestation and decree of God. See ep. lii., p. 68, 69; ep. xlv., p. 59; ep. lv., p. 82; ep. lxx., p. 113; ep. lxxix., p. 121. He regards bishops as the *successors of the apostles*, ep. xlii., p. 57. So that bishops are amenable to none, but to God only; while presbyters are amenable to the religious society, ep. xi., p. 19.—Deacons were created by the bishop; and therefore they can be punished by him alone, without the voice of the society, ep. lxx., p. 114.—Bishops have the same rights with apostles, whose successors they are. And hence, none but

§ 4. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government was followed by a corrupt state of the clergy. For although examples of primitive piety and virtue were not wanting, yet many were addicted to dissipation, arrogance, voluptuousness, contention, and other vices. This appears distinctly from the frequent lamentations of the most credible persons of those times.(5) Many bishops now affected the state of princes, and especially those who had charge of the more populous and wealthy congregations; for they sat on thrones, surrounded by their ministers, and other ensigns of their ghostly power, and perhaps also dazzled the eyes and the minds of the populace with their splendid attire. The *presbyters* imitated the example of their superiors, and neglecting the duties of their office, lived in indolence and pleasure. And this imboldened the *deacons* to make encroachments upon the office and the prerogatives of the presbyters.

§ 5. And hence, in my opinion, originated those *minor orders* of the clergy, which in this century were everywhere added to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The words *subdeacons*, *acolythi*, *ostiarii*, *lectors*, *exorcists*, and *copiatae*, designate officers, which I think the church would have never had, if the rulers of it had possessed more piety or true religion. But when the honours and prerogatives of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the *deacons* also became more inflated, and refused to perform those meaner offices to which they once cheerfully submitted. The offices designated by these new titles, are in great measure explained by the words themselves. The *exorcists* owed their origin to the doctrine of the new Platonists, adopted by the Christians, that evil spirits have a strong desire after the human body, and that vicious men are not so much impelled to sin by their natural depravity and by the influence of bad examples, as by the suggestions of some evil spirit lodging within them.(6) The *copiatae* were employed in the burial of the dead.

God can take cognizance of their actions, ep. lxi., p. 121.—The whole church is founded on the bishop; and no one is a true member of the church, who is not submissive to his bishop, ep. lxi., p. 123.—Bishops represent *Christ* himself, and govern and judge in his name, ep. lv., ad Corn., p. 81, 82.—Hence all bishops, in the following ages, styled themselves *Vicars of Christ*. See *J. Bingham's Orig. Eccles.*, vol. i., p. 81, &c. In the ninth century, a bishop of Paris is so styled in a letter of *Servatus Lupus*, ep. xcix, p. 149, ed. Baluze. After the ninth century, the bishops of Rome assumed the exclusive right to this as well as other honorary episcopal titles.—*Schl.* from *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor., p. 588, &c.]

(5) *Origen*. Comment. in Matthæum, pt. i., Opp., p. 420, 441, 442. *Eusebius*, Historia Eccles., lib. viii., cap. 1, p. 291, and others. [*Cyprian*, in many of his epistles.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *J. Godofredus*, ad Codicem Theodosianum, tom. vi., p. 48. [Several of the Catholic writers, as e. g., *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, and *Schelstrate*, believed these minor orders of the clergy were instituted by the

apostles. But some of the most learned writers of the Romish communion, and the Protestants generally, maintain that they were first instituted in the third century. See Cardinal *Bona*, *Rerum Liturgicar.*, l. i., c. 25, § 16, 17. *Morin*, de Ordinatione, pt. iii., Exerc. 14, c. 1, and *Bingham's Orig. Eccles.*, vol. i. *G. J. Planck*, *Gesch. der christl. kirchl. Gesellschafts-Verfassung*, vol. i., p. 143–149. Not one of these orders is even named by any writer who lived before *Tertullian*; nor are all of them named by him. *Cyprian*, in the middle of the third century, mentions hypodiaconi, acolythi, and lectores. See his *Epp.*, 14, 24, 36, 42, 49, 79, ed. Baluz. And *Cornelius*, bp. of Rome, contemporary with *Cyprian*, in an epistle which is preserved by *Eusebius*, II. E., vi., c. 43, represents his church as embracing 46 presbyters, (πρεσβυτέρους); 7 deacons, (διακόνες); 7 subdeacons, (εποδιακόνες); 42 acolythi, (ἀκολυθῆς); and exorcists, (ἐξορκίζας), readers, (ἀναγνώσας), with doorkeepers, (πύλωποις), together 52.—The particular functions of these inferior orders are but imperfectly defined by the writers of the third century. From the epistles of *Cyprian* above

§ 6. Marriage was allowed to all the clergy, from the highest rank to the lowest. Yet those were accounted more holy and excellent, who lived in celibacy. For it was the general persuasion, that those who lived in wedlock were much more exposed to the assaults of evil spirits than others : (7) and it was of immense importance to the Christian cause that no impure or malignant spirit should assail the mind or the body of one who was to instruct and govern others. Such persons therefore wished, if possible, to have nothing to do with conjugal life. And this many of the clergy, especially in Africa, endeavoured to accomplish with the least violence to their inclinations ; for they received into their house, and even to their beds, some one of those holy females who had vowed perpetual chastity, affirming however, most religiously, that they had no disgraceful intercourse with these holy sisters. (8) These concubines were by the Greeks called *συνεισάκτοι*, and by the Latins *mulieres subintroductæ*. Many of the bishops indeed sternly opposed this shameful practice ; but it was a long time before it was wholly abolished.

§ 7. Of the writers of this century the most distinguished for the celebrity of his name and for the extent of his writings, was *Origen*, a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man truly great, and a luminary to the Christian world. Had his discernment and the soundness of his judgment been equal to his genius, his piety, his industry, his erudition, and his other accomplishments, he would deserve almost unbounded commendation. As he is, all should revere his virtues and his merits. (9)—The second was

cited, it appears that subdeacons and acolythi, singly or together, were frequently the bearers of public letters to and from bishops ; and that readers were employed to read the scriptural lessons in time of public worship. The writers and councils of the *fourth* century describe more fully the duties of all these petty officers.—*Tr.*]

(7) *Porphyrus*, *περι ἀποχρῆς*, lib. iv., p. 417.

(8) See *H. Dodwell*, *Diss. tertii Cyprianica* ; and *Lud. Ant. Muratorius*, *Diss. de Synisactis et Agapetis*, in his *Anecdota Græca*, p. 218 ; *Steph. Baluze*, ad *Cypriani Epistol.*, p. 5, 12, and others.—[This shameful practice commenced anterior to this century. Slight allusions to it are found in the Shepherd of *Hermas* and in *Tertullian* ; but the first distinct mention of it is in *Cyprian*, who inveighs severely against it in some of his epistles.—It is to be remembered, that none but virgin sisters in the church, and they under a vow of perpetual chastity, became *συνεισάκτοι*. With these some of the single clergy attempted to live, in the manner in which certain married people then lived,—dwelling and even sleeping together, but with a mutual agreement to have no conjugal intercourse. Such connexions they considered as a marriage of souls, without the marriage of bodies. See *Mosheim*, de *Rebus Christianor.*, &c., p. 599, &c.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *P. D. Huet*, *Origeniana*, a learn-

ed and valuable work ; *Lud. Doucin*, *Histoire d'Origene et des mouvemens arrivées dans l'église au sujet de sa doctrine*, Paris, 1700, 8vo ; and *Bayle*, *Dictionnaire*, tom. iii., art. *Origene* ; and many others.—[*Origen*, surnamed *Adamantius*, was an Alexandrian Greek, born of Christian parents A.D. 185. His father *Leonidas* was a man of letters, a devout Christian, and took great pains with the education of his son, especially in the holy scriptures, some portion of which he required him daily to commit to memory. His education, begun under his father, was completed under *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and the philosopher *Ammonius Saccas*. *Origen* was distinguished for precocity of genius, early piety, and indefatigable industry. When his father suffered martyrdom A.D. 202, *Origen*, then 17 years old, was eager to suffer with him, but was prevented by his mother. He wrote to his father in prison, exhorting him to steadfastness in the faith, and to be unsolicitous about his family. The whole property of the family was confiscated, and *Origen*, with his widowed mother and six younger sons, were left in poverty. But the persecution having exterminated or driven away all the Christian schoolmasters, *Origen* found no difficulty in procuring a school, for which his talents so well qualified him. The next year, A.D. 203, *Demetrius*, bp. of Alexandria, advanced him to the mastership of the catechetical school, though he was then

Julius Africanus, a very learned man, most of whose labours and works

but 18 years old. His talents as an instructor, his eminent piety, and his assiduous attention to those who suffered in the persecution, procured him high reputation and numerous friends among the Christians; but his great success in making converts to Christianity and forming his pupils to be intelligent and devoted Christians, rendered him odious to the pagans, who watched about his house and hunted him through the city, in order to assassinate him. The austerity of his life was great. He fed on the coarsest fare, went barefoot, and slept on the ground. He spent the whole day in teaching and in active duties, and devoted most of the night to his private studies and to devotion. About this time he sold his large and valuable collection of pagan authors, for a perpetual income of four *oboli* (about seven cents) per diem, which he regarded as a competent support. Construing the passage in Matth. xix., 12, literally, he emasculated himself, in order to avoid temptation in his intercourse with his female pupils. About the year 212, he made a short visit to Rome. On his return he took his former pupil *Heracles* to be his assistant in the school, so that he might devote more time to theology and the exposition of the Scriptures. Many learned persons, pagans and heretics, were converted by him; and among them, *Ambrose*, a Valentinian and a man of wealth, who became a liberal patron of Origen, and at last died a martyr. In the year 215, the persecution under *Caracalla* obliged Origen to flee from Alexandria. He retired to Cæsarea in Palestine, where he was received with high respect; and though not even a deacon at that time, the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem allowed him to expound the Scriptures publicly in their presence. The next year, *Demetrius* called him back to Alexandria and to his mastership of the catechetical school. About this time an Arabian prince invited him to his court, to impart to him Christian instruction. Afterwards, *Mummea* the mother of the emperor *Alexander Severus*, sent for him to Antioch, in order to hear him preach. In the year 228, he was publicly called to Achaia, to withstand the heretics who disturbed the churches there. On his return through Palestine, *Theoctistus* bp. of Cæsarea, and *Alexander* bp. of Jerusalem, who had before treated him with marked attention, ordained him a presbyter, to the great offence of *Demetrius*, who was envious of the growing reputation of his catechist. *Demetrius* had little to object against Origen, except that he was a eunuch, and that foreign bishops had no right to ordain his layman. Controversy ensued, and in the year 230,

Demetrius assembled two councils against him, the first of which banished Origen from Alexandria, and the second deprived him of his clerical office. *Demetrius* also wrote letters to Rome and elsewhere, to excite odium against this unoffending man. *Heracles* now succeeded him in the school at Alexandria, and Origen retired, A.D. 231, to Cæsarea in Palestine. Here he resumed his office of instructor, and continued to write expositions of the Bible. But in the year 235, a persecution in Palestine obliged him to flee to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he lived concealed for two years. After his return to Palestine, he visited Athens; and about the year 244, was called to attend a council at Bostra in Arabia, against *Beryllus* bp. of that place, who was heretical in respect to the personal existence of Christ previous to his incarnation. Origen converted him to the orthodox faith. *Demetrius* his persecutor died A.D. 232, and was succeeded by *Heracles*, a disciple of Origen, after whom *Dionysius* the Great filled the see of Alexandria from A.D. 248 to 265. The persecution of Origen died with his personal enemy *Demetrius*; and he was greatly beloved and honoured by all around him till the day of his death. His residence was now fixed at Cæsarea in Palestine; but he occasionally visited other places. His time was occupied in an extensive correspondence, in preaching, and in composing books explanatory of the Bible, and in defence of Christianity. Against the more learned pagans and the heretics of those times, he was a champion that had no equal; he was also considered as a devout and exemplary Christian, and was, beyond question, the first biblical scholar of the age. He was master of the literature and the science of that age, which he valued only as subservient to the cause of Christ; but he was more skilful in employing them against pagans and heretics, than in the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revelation. In the latter part of his life, during the Decian persecution A.D. 250, he was imprisoned for a considerable time, and came near to martyrdom, which he showed himself willing to meet. He was however released, but his sufferings in prison, added to his intense literary labours, had broken down his constitution, and he died A.D. 254, at Tyre, in the 69th year of his age.—His winning eloquence, his great learning, his amiable temper, and his reputation for sincere and ardent piety, gave him immense influence, especially among the well-informed and the higher classes in society. No man, since the apostles, had been more indefatigable, and no

are lost.(10) The name of *Hippolytus* ranks very high among both the

one had done more to diffuse knowledge and make the Christian community intelligent, united, and respectable in the view of mankind. He was in general orthodox, according to the standard of that age; but, unfettered in his speculations and unguarded in his communications, he threw out some crude opinions, which the next age gathered up and blazoned abroad, and for which he was accounted by some a heretic. The principal errors ascribed to him, are derived from his four Books *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, (*de principiis*, on the first principles of human knowledge), and are (1) the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in material bodies, for offences committed in a former state of being: (2) the pre-existence of *Christ's* human soul, and its union with the divine nature anterior to the incarnation of *Christ*: (3) the transformation of our material bodies into ethereal ones, at the resurrection: (4) the final recovery of all men and even devils, through the mediation of *Christ*.—*Origen* could number among his pupils many eminent martyrs and divines, among whom *Firmilianus* of Cappadocia, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and *Dionysius* the Great, bp. of Alexandria, are best known at the present day.—His life and history are best related by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. vi., *passim*; and by *Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.*, cap. 55, and ep. 41 or 65. The united work of *Pamphilus* and *Eusebius* in defence of *Origen*, in six Books, is unfortunately lost, except the first book, of which we have a translation by *Rufinus*. *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* 64, gives a philippic upon *Origen* and his followers. *Photius*, *Biblioth. cxviii.*, affords us some knowledge of his lost works.—*Origen* was a most voluminous writer. *Eusebius* says he collected 100 Epistles of *Origen*; and that when 60 years old, *Origen* permitted stenographers to write down his extempore discourses.—Besides these he composed eight Books against *Celsus*, in defence of Christianity, which are still extant; four Books *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, extant in a Latin translation by *Rufinus*; ten Books entitled *Stromata*, which are lost: his Hexapla and Tetrapla, of which little remains; and tracts on prayer, martyrdom, and the resurrection. But his principal works are expositions of the scriptures. It is said he wrote on every book in the Bible, except the Apocalypse. His allegorical mode of interpreting scripture is described by *Mosheim*, in the next chapter. *Origen's* expositions are of three kinds; (1) Homilies, or popular lectures; (2) Commentaries, divided into Books, which are full, elaborate, and learned expositions; (3) Scholia, or short notes,

intended especially for the learned. A collection of *Origen's* Scholia, and scattered remarks on Scripture, compiled by *Basil* the Great and *Gregory Nazianzen*, is extant, bearing the title of *φιλοκαλία*. A large part of his Homilies and Commentaries are wholly lost, and some of the others have come to us only in the Latin translation of *Rufinus*.—The earlier editions of *Origen's* works are chiefly in Latin, and of little value. *P. D. Huet*, a Benedictine monk, first published, A.D. 1668, in 2 vols. fol., the expository works of *Origen*, Greek and Latin, with notes, and a valuable introduction entitled *Origeniana*. *Bern. de Montfaucon*, another Benedictine, collected and published what remains of his Hexapla and Tetrapla, Paris, 1714, 2 vols. fol. But the best edition of all his works, except the Hexapla, is that of the Benedictines *Charles* and *Charles Vincent*, *de la Rue*, Paris, 1733–59, 4 vols. fol.—The text of this edition, Gr. and Lat., without the notes and dissertations, was republished by *Oberthür*, Würzburg, 1780–93, 15 vols. 8vo.—The principal modern writers concerning *Origen*, besides *Huet* and the *de la Rues*, are *Tillemont*, *Mem. à l'Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. iii., p. 216–264. *Bayle*, *Dict.*, art. *Origene*; *Cave*, *Hist. Lit.*, vol. i., p. 112, &c. *Lardner*, *Credibility*, pt. ii., vol. ii., p. 161, &c. *Hulox*, *Defence of Origen*; *Donein*, *Histoire d'Origene*, Paris, 1700, 8vo. *Mosheim*, *de Reb. Christ.*, p. 605–680; *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. iv., p. 29–145. *Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., part iii., p. 1172–1214. *Milner's* account of *Origen*, *Eccl. Hist.*, cent. iii., ch. 5, 6, 15, is not impartial.—*Tr.*]

(10) [*Julius Africanus*, for erudition, and as an interpreter of scripture, is ranked with *Clemens Alex.* and *Origen*; by *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. 35. The best account of this distinguished man, is derived from *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., c. 31, and *Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.*, c. 63. He was probably of Nicopolis, once called Emmaus, in Judea, and is supposed to have died, when a man in years, about A.D. 232.—Of his life little is known, except that he once visited Alexandria, to confer with *Heraclas*, head of the catechetical school after *Origen*; and that, the city of Nicopolis having been burned about A.D. 221, *Africanus* was sent as envoy to the emperor, with a petition that it might be rebuilt.—His principal work was *Annals of the world*, from the creation down to A.D. 221, in five Books. This work, of which only fragments now remain, was highly esteemed by the ancients, and was the basis of many similar works, namely, the *Chronicons* of *Eusebius*, *Syn-*

writers and the martyrs; but his history is involved in much obscurity.(11) The writings now extant bearing the name of this great man, are not without reason regarded by many as being either spurious or at least corrupted. *Gregory*, bishop of New Cæsarea [in Pontus], was surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, on account of the numerous and distinguished miracles which he is said to have wrought. But few of his writings are now extant; his miracles are questioned by many at the present day.(12) I

cellus, *Malala*, *Theophanes*, *Cedrenus*, and others. He was author of a letter to *Aristides*, reconciling the two genealogies of our Saviour. Of this work we have a long extract in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., i., 7, and a fragment in *Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. ii., p. 115. *Africanus* supposed Matthew to give the true descent of *Joseph* from David by *Solomon*, and Luke to give his legal descent from the same by *Nathan*, according to the law for raising up seed to a deceased brother. *Jacob* and *Heli*, the two reputed fathers of *Joseph*, he supposed, were half-brothers, having the same mother, but different fathers; and *Heli* dying childless, *Jacob* married his widow and begat *Joseph*, whom the law accounted as the son of the deceased *Heli*.—Another letter of *Africanus*, addressed to *Origen*, is still extant in the works of *Origen*, vol. i., p. 10-12, ed. de la Rue. The object of this letter is, to prove the history of *Susannah* spurious, and the work of some person much younger than *Daniel*. His chief argument is, that the writer makes *Daniel* play upon the Greek words *σῴζω* and *πῶρω*, in verses 54, 55, 58, 59, while examining the witnesses against *Susannah*.—*Eusebius* and others ascribe to *Africanus* another and larger work, entitled *Κεστόι*. It is a miscellany, and unworthy of a Christian divine. *Valesius* thinks *Eusebius* mistook, attributing the work of some pagan bearing the same name, to this Christian father. Others suppose it might have been written by *Africanus*, in his youth, or before his conversion. Many fragments of it have been collected by *Thevenot*, and published in his Collection of the writings of the ancient Greek mathematicians, Paris, 1693, fol.—*Tr.*]

(11) The Benedictine monks have, with great labour and erudition, endeavoured to dispel this darkness. See *Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. i., p. 361, &c., Paris, 1733, 4to.—[Both *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., vi., c. 20, 22, and *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 61, make him to have flourished in the reign of *Severus*, A.D. 222, &c., and to have been a bishop, but of what city they could not learn. Subsequent writers were divided, some representing him as an Arabian bishop, and others as bishop of Ostia near Rome, whence he is surnamed *Portuensis*. Per-

haps he spent part of his life in the East, and part in the West. That he was a martyr, is generally conceded: though the poem of *Prudentius* on the martyrdom of *Hippolytus*, refers to another person, who was a Roman presbyter.—*Eusebius*, l. c., gives this account of his writings: "Besides many other works, he wrote a treatise concerning Easter, in which he describes the succession of events, and proposes a paschal cycle of 16 years; the work terminates with the first year of the emperor Alexander," (*Severus*, A.D. 222). "His other writings which have reached me, are these: on the *Hexaëmeron*" (*Gen.*, ch. i.); "on what follows the *Hexaëmeron*; against *Marcion*; on the Canticles; on parts of *Ezekiel*; concerning Easter; against all the heresies." Besides these, *Jerome* mentions his Commentaries on *Exodus*, *Zachariah*, the *Psalms*, *Isaiah*, *Daniel*, the *Apocalypse*, *Proverbs*, and *Ecclesiastes*; and tracts concerning *Saul* and the witch, *Antichrist*, the resurrection; and his discourse in praise of our Lord and Saviour. Some other works of *Hippolytus* are enumerated in an inscription on the base of his statue, dug up near Rome in the year 1551; also by *Photius*, Biblioth., No. 121 and 122, and *Ebedjesus*, in *Assemani*, Biblioth. Orient., tom. iii., pt. i. His Paschal Cycle is his only work that has come down to us entire. The dialogue concerning *Christ* and *Antichrist*, still extant, if really his, does him little credit as a theologian. The concluding part of his work against all the heresies, still remains, and gives us the best account we have, though a lame one, of the heresy of *Noëtus*.—All that remains of him, genuine and adulterated, and all that is ascribed to him, are well edited by *Fabricius*, in two thin volumes fol., Hamb., 1716-18.—For a more full account of him and his writings, besides the *Histoire Litt. de la France*, and *Fabricius*, ad *Hippol.* Opera, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires de l'Hist. Eccles.*, tom. iii., p. 104 and 309, &c. *Cave*, Hist. Lit., vol. i., p. 102, &c. *Lardner*, Credib., pt. ii., vol. ii., p. 69, &c. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. iv., p. 154, &c. *Neander*, Kircheng., vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1147, &c.—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Anton. ran Dale*, Preface to his book de Oraculis, p. 6. [*Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. ii., p. 351, &c., and p. 330

could wish that many writings of *Dionysius*, bishop of Alexandria, were now extant; for the few fragments which have reached us, show that he was a man of distinguished wisdom and mildness of disposition, and prove that the ancients used no flattery when they styled him *Dionysius the Great*.⁽¹³⁾ *Methodius* was a man of piety, and had some weight of char-

—392, and *Lardner*, *Credibility*, pt. ii., vol. ii., p. 450, &c.—*Gregory* of New Cæsarea in Pontus, whose original name was *Theodorus*, was born of heathen parents at New Cæsarea near the beginning of this century. His family was wealthy and respectable. After the death of his father, which was when he was fourteen years old, his mother and the children became nominally Christians. But *Gregory* was a stranger to the Bible, and ambitious to make a figure in the world. About the year 231, he left Pontus, intending to study law in the famous law school at Berytus, but meeting with *Origen* at Cæsarea, he was induced to change his purpose. He applied himself to the study of the Bible, was baptized, assumed the name of *Gregory*, and continued under the instruction of *Origen* eight years, except that he fled to Alexandria for a short time to avoid persecution. He was now a devoted Christian, and a man of great promise. On leaving *Origen*, he composed and read in a public assembly an eulogy on his instructor, in which he gives account of his own past life and of the manner in which *Origen* had allured him to the study of the scriptures, and changed all his views. Taking an affectionate leave of his master, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of his native city, New Cæsarea, where he spent the remainder of his life. He was a laborious and successful pastor, and highly respected for his talents and piety, as well as for numerous miracles which he is said to have wrought. When created bishop, he found but seventeen Christians in his very populous diocese. When he died, there was only about the same number of pagans in it. He and his flock endured persecution in the year 250. He attended the first council of Antioch, against *Paul* of Samosata in the year 264 or 265, and died soon after.—Some account of him is given by *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 30, and vii., 14, 23. *Jerome*, de *Viris Illust.*, c. 65, and *Ep. ad Magnum*. But his great eulogists among the ancients, were the two brothers *Basil* the Great, and *Gregory* Nyssen, whose grandmother sat under the ministry of *Greg. Thaum.*, and furnished her grandchildren with an account of him. *Basil* speaks of him in his book on the Holy Spirit, and in his *Epistles*, No. 28, 110, 204, 207, or 62, 64, 75, 63; and *Nyssen*, in his life of *Gregory Thaum.*, inter *Opp. Greg. Nys.*, tom. iii., p. 536, &c. Among the

moderns who give us his history, and enumerate his works, see *Tillemont*, *Memoires* —à l'*Hist. Eccl.*, tom. iv., p. 131, &c., and *Notes sur St. Greg. Thaum.*, p. 47. *Du Pin*, *Nov. Biblioth. des Aut. Eccles.*, tom. i., p. 184, &c. *Fabrieus*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, vol. v., p. 247, &c. *Cave*, *Hist. Lit.*, vol. i. *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., p. 1224, &c. *Schroeckh*, ubi supra, *Lard.*, ubi supra, and *Milner*, *Eccles. Hist.*, cent. iii., ch. 18.—The only genuine works of *Gregory*, that are extant, are his *Eulogy on Origen*, which has been mentioned; a *Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*; a short *Confession of faith*, (the last part of which some have questioned); and a *Letter*, containing counsel for the treatment of the lapsed.—The spurious works attributed to him, are, *Capita xii. de Fide*, with anathemas;—in *Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ—Mariæ Sermones tres*; in *Sancta Theophania*, sive de apparitione Dei, et Christi Baptismo, *Sermo*; de *Anima* disputatio ad Tatianum; *Expositio Fidei*, (ἡ κατὰ μέρος πίσις), relating only to the Trinity.—All these were collected and published, with learned notes, by *Gerard Vossius*, Mayence, 1604, 4to. and Paris, 1622, fol., with the works of *Macarius*, *Basil* of Seleucia, and a tract of *Zonaras*, subjoined.—*Tr.*]

(13) The history of *Dionysius* is carefully written by *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tome i., livr. ii., cap. 5, p. 68.—[He was probably born of heathen parents, but early converted to the Christian faith by *Origen*, under whom he had his education at Alexandria. He became a presbyter there; and succeeded *Heraclius*, as head of the catechetical school, about the year 232, and on the death of *Heraclius*, A.D. 248, he again succeeded him in the episcopal chair, which he filled till his death in the year 265. We know little of his history while a catechist, except that he then read carefully all the works of heretics and pagans, and made himself master of the controversies of the day. (*Euseb.*, H. E., lib. vii., c. 7). As a bishop he was uncommonly laborious and faithful. He lived in stormy times, was called to almost continual contests with errorists, and had little rest from persecution, in which he and his flock suffered exceedingly. These sufferings are described in the copious extracts from his writings, preserved by *Eusebius*, in his *Eccles. History*, book vi. and vii. In the year 249, the pagans of Alexandria made

acter; but the few works of his yet remaining, prove him not to have been a man of an accurate and discriminating mind.(14)

insurrection against the Christians, murdered several, assaulted, and plundered, and drove into hiding-places most of the rest. The next year the general persecution under *Decius* commenced, and *Dionysius* was under arrest, and suffered much, with his flock, for a year and a half. Soon after his release, the pestilence began to lay waste the church and the city, and did not entirely cease till the end of twelve years. About the same time, *Nepos* an Egyptian bishop, embraced and disseminated millenarian principles; but was at length reclaimed by *Dionysius*. The warm contest respecting the rebaptism of converted heretics, about the year 256, was submitted by both parties to him, and drew forth several able productions from his pen. Not long after, he had to withstand the Sabellians, in a long and arduous controversy. In the year 257, the persecution under *Valerian* commenced; and for about two years, *Dionysius* was in banishment, transported from place to place, and subjected to great sufferings. After his return, in the year 260, there was insurrection among the pagans, and civil war and famine raged at Alexandria. Scarcely was quiet restored, when this aged and faithful servant of God was solicited to aid in the controversy against *Paul* of Samosata. His infirmities prevented his attending the council of Antioch in 265, where *Paul* was condemned; but he wrote his judgment of the controversy, sent it to the council, and died soon after, in the close of that year.—In his controversy with the Sabellians, he was—to say the least—unfortunate. For in his zeal to maintain a *personal distinction* between the Father and the Son, he let drop expressions which seemed to imply, that the latter was of another and an inferior nature to the former. This led the Sabellians to accuse him of heresy; and a council assembled at Rome, called on him to explain his views. He replied in several books or letters, addressed to *Dionysius* bishop of Rome, which pretty well satisfied his contemporaries. Afterwards, when the Arians claimed him, *Athanasius* came forth in vindication of his orthodoxy. Dr. Mosheim, (de Rebus Christianor., p. 696, &c.), supposes that *Dionysius* differed from the orthodox on the one hand, and from Sabellius on the other, in the following manner. They all agreed, that in Jesus Christ, *two natures*, the human and the divine, were united. The orthodox maintained, that *both* natures constituted but *one person*, and denied personality to the human nature. *Sabellius* admitted the union of two natures in Christ, but denied

personality to his *divine* nature. *Dionysius* distinguished *two persons*, as well as two natures in Christ; and affirmed that the actions and sufferings of the human nature could not be predicated of the divine nature.—*Natalis Alexander* has a dissertation (Hist. Eccles., sæcul. iii., Diss. xix.), in vindication of the orthodoxy, though not of all the phraseology of *Dionysius*.—For a knowledge of the life and writings of *Dionysius*, the chief original sources are *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 29, 35, 40–42, 44–46; l. vii., c. 1, 4–11, 20–28. Præpar. Evang., l. xiv., c. 23–27. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 69, and Prefatio ad Lib. 18, Comment. in Esaiam; *Athanasius*, de Sententia Dionysii; and de Synodi Nicænæ Decretis; *Basil*, de Spiritu Sancto, c. 29. Epist. ad Amphiloeh., and Epist. ad Maximum.—Of his works, only two short compositions have come to us entire; namely, his very sensible letter to *Novatian*, (apud *Eusebii* Hist. Eccles., vi., 45), and his Epistola Canonica ad *Basilidem*, in which he gives his opinion respecting the proper hour for terminating the fast before Easter, and the obligation of Christians to observe certain Jewish laws respecting personal uncleanness. But we have valuable extracts from many of his letters and books. *Eusebius* gives portions of the following; namely, his epistle to *Germanus*, giving account of his flight and sufferings in the Decian persecution. (H. E., vi., 40, and vii., 11.)—Ep. to *Fabius* bishop of Antioch, describing the sufferings of his flock in the same persecution. (H. E., vi., 40–42, 44.)—Ep. to *Hermammion*, on the characters of the emperors *Decius* and *Valerian*. (H. E., vii., 1, 10, 23.)—Ep. to *Stephen* bishop of Rome, on the peace after the persecution of *Gallus*. (H. E., vii., 4, 5.)—Ep. to *Domitius* and *Didymus*, describing the Decian persecution at Alexandria, (H. E., vii., 11.)—Ep. to *Hierar*, describing the sedition at Alexandria, (H. E., vii., 21.)—Ep. to *Sixtus* bishop of Rome, on rebaptism of heretics, and on the Sabellians, (H. E., vii., 5, 6.)—Another ep. to the same, on rebaptism, &c., (H. E., vii., 9.)—Ep. to *Philemon*, a Roman presbyter, on the same subject, (H. E., vii., 7.)—Ep. to *Dionysius*, then a presbyter at Rome, on the same subject, and concerning Novatian, (H. E., vii., 7, 8.)—Two Books against *Nepos* and the Millenarians, on the promises to the saints in the Apocalypse, the nature of that book, and its author, (H. E., vii., 24, 25.)—Ep. to his own flock, after the plague, consolatory, (H. E., vii., 22.)—Libri iv. de Natura, against Epicurean doctrines, dedicated to

§ 8. Of the Latin writers of this century, *Cyprian* bishop of Carthage, deservedly stands first. The epistles and tracts of this distinguished and eloquent man, breathe such a spirit of ardent piety, that almost no one can read them without feeling his soul stirred within him. Yet *Cyprian* would doubtless have been a better writer, if he had been less studious of rhetorical ornaments, and a better bishop, if he had been more capable of controlling his temper and of discriminating between truth and error. (15)

his son, (*Euseb.*, Præp. Evang., xiv., 23-27.)—*Athanasius* also gives extracts from various of his works.—*Eusebius* mentions several works of *Dionysius*, from which he gives no extracts, (H. E., vi., 46, and vii., 26); namely, Epistles to the brethren in *Egypt*, de Pœnitentia—to *Cornelius* bishop of Rome, de Pœnitentia—to his own church, a monitory epistle—to *Origen*, on Martyrdom—to the brethren of *Laodicea*—to the brethren in *Armenia*—to *Cornelius* bishop of Rome, concerning *Novatian*—to the brethren at Rome, three epistles concerning the office of a deacon, concerning peace, and de Pœnitentia—to the confessors at Rome, who favoured *Novatian*—to the same, after they returned to the church, two letters—to *Sixtus* and the church at Rome, on rebaptism, &c.—to *Dionysius of Rome*, concerning *Lucian*—and various *Paschal Epistles*, (a species of pastoral letters), addressed to *Flavius*—to *Domitius* and *Dulgnus*—to his own presbyters—to his flock, after the persecution of *Valerian*—to the brethren in *Egypt*, &c.]

(14) [*Methodius*, Patarensis, Eubulius, was bp. of Olympus, or of Patara, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre. He lived during the last half of the third century; and died a martyr, at Chalcis in Greece, probably A.D. 311, during the Diocletian persecution. *Jerome*, (de Viris Illustr., c. 83), ranks him among the popular writers, and commends him especially for the neatness of his style; but *Socrates*, (in his Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 13), represents him as one of those low and contemptible scribblers, who endeavour to bring themselves into notice by assailing the characters of their superiors. His works, as enumerated by *Jerome*, are (1) Two Books against *Porphyry*, (a large work, now lost)—(2) Feast of the Ten Virgins, (a dialogue of pious females, in praise of celibacy. It is still extant, though perhaps corrupted; but it does its author little credit)—(3) On the resurrection of the body, against *Origen*, opus egregium. (It is but an indifferent work; much of it is preserved by *Epiphanius*, Hæres. lxiv. *Photius*, Bibl. cccxiv., &c.)—(4) On the Witch of Endor, against *Origen*; (not extant)—(5) On free will (and the origin of evil; not from matter, but from abuse of human liberty. Extracts from it remain)—(6) Commentaries on Genesis and

Canticles, (almost wholly lost)—(7) Many other popular works, (not described by *Jerome*).—The works of *Methodius*, so far as they remain, were edited with those of *Amphilochius* and *Andreas Cretensis*, by *Francis Combefis*, Paris, 1644, fol. But the Feast of Virgins first appeared in the original Greek, in *Combefis*, Auctar. noviss. Biblioth. Patr. Græc., part i.—Several discourses of the younger *Methodius*, patriarch of Constantinople in the 9th century, have been ascribed to the senior *Methodius*.—Tr.]

(15) [*Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus* was born of heathen parents, and probably about the year 200, at Carthage in Africa. He was rather dissipated, but was a man of genius, and a teacher of rhetoric. In the year 244 or 245 he was converted to Christianity, by *Cæcilius* a presbyter of Carthage, whose name he assumed. An account of his conversion, we have in his tract, de Gratia Dei, ad Donatum. As soon as he became a Christian, he distributed all his property in charity to the poor, devoted himself much to the study of the Bible and of his favourite author *Tertullian*, and showed a zeal and earnestness in religion seldom equalled. He was made a presbyter a few months after his conversion, and was advanced to the episcopal chair in the year 248. As a bishop he was indefatigable and efficient. Few men ever accomplished so much in a long life, as *Cyprian* did in the ten years of his episcopacy. In the year 250 the Decian persecution obliged him to leave Carthage, and live in concealment for more than a year. During his exile he wrote 39 epistles, which are extant, addressed to his church, to its officers collectively or individually, to other bishops, and to various individuals. On his return to Carthage A.D. 251, he had much to do to collect and regulate his flock: a controversy arose respecting the reception of the lapsed to Christian fellowship; and *Cyprian* had personal contests with some of his presbyters, who were opposed to him. He was also drawn into the Novatian controversy. The persecution was soon after renewed by the emperor *Gallus*; and pestilence and famine spread wide; and incursions of barbarians from the desert laid waste the back country. *Cyprian* wrote and preached incessantly; and in the year 253,

The *Dialogue of Minucius Felix*, which he entitled *Octavius*, answers the arguments by which the Christians were commonly attacked by their adversaries, in a manner so spirited and so handsome, that it cannot be disregarded except by those who are willing to be ignorant of the state of the church in this century. (16) The seven Books of *Arnobius*, the African, *against the Gentiles*, are more full and copious, and though obscure in several places, will not be read without both pleasure and profit. Yet this rhetorician, who was superficial in his knowledge of Christian doc-

called a council and roused up the African churches to great efforts for redeeming Christian captives. For several years he was most laboriously employed in preaching, composing tracts, and directing the ecclesiastical affairs, not only of Carthage and Africa, but of other countries. In the year 257, the persecution under *Valerian* broke out, and *Cyprian* was banished to Curubis. The persecution was severe in Africa: many were imprisoned, condemned to the mines, or put to death. *Cyprian* gave what aid he could to his suffering brethren. The next year, A.D. 258, he was recalled from banishment, summoned before the new governor, *Maximus*, and condemned to be beheaded.—*Cyprian* lived but 12 years after he embraced Christianity, and during 10 of these he was incessantly engaged in active duties. It was impossible therefore, that he should become a very learned theologian. Though a man of genius, he was not a metaphysician or philosopher, and seems not formed for abstruse speculations. He was an orator and a man of business, rather than a profound scholar. The practical part of Christianity, and the order and discipline of the church, most engaged his attention. Naturally ardent, and poring daily over the writings of *Tertullian*, he imbibed very much the spirit and the principles of that gloomy Montanist: and having high ideas of episcopal power, and great intrepidity of character, he was an energetic prelate, and a severe disciplinarian.—The best original sources for the history of this distinguished man, are his own numerous letters and tracts, and the *Passio S. Cypriani*, or account of his martyrdom, written by *Pontius*, one of his deacons. He is very honourably mentioned by many of the fathers; and *Gregory Naz.* wrote a professed eulogy of him. The moderns also, especially the Catholics and the English Episcopalians, have written elaborately concerning his history, his works, and his opinions. See bp. *Pearson's* *Annales Cyprianici*, and *H. Dodwell's* *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, in the Oxford edition of *Cyprian's* works, 1682; *Tillemont, Mémoires*—à l'Hist. Eccles., tom. iv., p. 19, &c., and *Notes sur St. Cyprien*, p. 10, &c.; *Prud. Maran, Vita S. Cypriani*, prefixed to *Opp. Cypri.*, ed.

Paris, 1726, p. 38–134; and *J. Milner's* *Church Hist.*, cent. iii., ch. 7–15.—His works consist of 81 Epistles, and 14 Treatises, which are accounted genuine. They are nearly all practical,—hortatory, controversial, and official or friendly letters.—His style is neither perspicuous nor chaste, but ardent and animated. He and *Lactantius*, it has been said, were the fathers of ecclesiastical Latinity.—The earlier editions of his works by *Erasmus* and others, arranged his letters in Books, without regard to their dates or subjects. The edition of *Pamelius*, 1556, republished by *Rigaltius*, 1664, attempted to arrange them in chronological order. The Oxford edition by bp. *Fell*, 1682, fol., perfected this arrangement. The edition prepared by *Baluze*, and published by *Prudentius Maran*, Paris, 1726, fol., retains the order of Pamelius. The two last are the best editions.—*Tr.*

(16) [*Minucius Felix* was a respectable Christian barrister at Rome, and is supposed to have been contemporary with *Tertullian*, and to have flourished about the year 220. He is mentioned by *Jerome*, de *Viris Illustr.*, c. 58, and by *Lactantius*, *Institut. Divinar.*, l. i., c. 11, and l. v., c. 1. Little is known of his history. His elegant *Dialogue*, between *Cæcilius* a pagan and *Octavius* a Christian, recounts the principal arguments urged for and against Christianity at that time, in a clear, concise, and forcible manner. The Latinity is pure and elegant. *Jerome* informs us that another tract, de *Fato vel contra Mathematicos*, was ascribed to him; but from its style, it was probably not his. This tract is now lost. In the middle ages, the *Octavius of Minucius* was mistaken for the 8th Book (Liber Octavus) of *Arnobius*; and it was so published in the earlier editions. It has been often republished. The best editions, cum notis variorum, are those of *Gronovius*, Leyden, 1709, 8vo; and of *Davis*, Cambridge, 1707 and 1711, 8vo. The Germans are fond of the edition of *Celarius*, 1698, 8vo, republished by *Linder*, 1760, and by *Ernesti*, 1773, 8vo.—It has been translated into French, Dutch, and English; the last, by *Reeves*, among his *Apologies in defence of the Christian religion*, vol. ii., Lond., 1709, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

trines, has intermixed great errors and great truths, and has set forth a strange philosophical kind of religion, very different from that ordinarily received.(17) The writers of less eminence, I leave to be learned from those who have professedly enumerated the learned men among Christians.(18)

(17) [*Arnobius*, senior, was a teacher of rhetoric at Sicca in Africa, during the reign of *Diocletian*. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 79. He was at first an open adversary of the Christian religion, but at length being fully convinced of its truth, he undertook to defend it in a learned and elaborate work. But, either his knowledge of Christianity was then very limited, or he had studied the Scriptures only in private, and without seeking instruction from the Christian teachers, for he entertained many singular opinions. *Jerome* reports, (Chron. ad. ann. xx. Constantini), that when *Arnobius* applied to the bishop for baptism, the latter refused him, from doubts of the sincerity of his conversion; and that *Arnobius* wrote his book to satisfy the mind of the bishop. This account is called in question by some. See *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., pt. ii., vol. iv., p. 7, and *Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., p. 1161, &c. He probably wrote in the beginning of the 4th century, and died perhaps about A.D. 326.—The best early editions of his work, are those printed at Leyden, 1651 and 1657, 4to. The latest edition is that of *Orell*, Lips., 1816, 8vo, in 2 parts, with an Appendix, 1817, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(18) [The following notices of other leading men in this century, may be interesting to the literary reader.

Caius, a learned ecclesiastic of Rome, in the beginning of this century, is mentioned by *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 59, and is quoted repeatedly by *Eusebius*. In his work against Proculus the Montanist, he assailed the Chiliasts, and ascribed but 13 epistles to St. Paul. *Euseb.*, H. E., ii., 25, iii., 28, and vi., 20. He has been supposed by some to be the author of the book against *Artemon*, quoted by *Euseb.*, H. E., v., 28.

Just before A.D. 200, *Theophilus* bp. of Antioch, *Bacchylus* bp. of Cæsarea in Palestine, and *Polycrates* bp. of Ephesus, called councils on the controversy respecting Easter day, and composed synodic epistles. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 43–45, and *Euseb.*, H. E., v., 23 and 25. From the epistle of *Polycrates*, valuable extracts are made by *Jerome*, l. c., and *Euseb.*, H. E., iii., 31, and v., 24.

At the commencement of this century, lived *Heraclitus*, *Maximus*, *Candidus*, *Ap-pion*, *Sextus*, and *Arabianus*, who were distinguished as writers, according to *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 46–51, and *Euseb.*, H. E.,

v., 27.—*Heraclitus* commented on Paul's Epistles; *Maximus* wrote concerning the origin of evil, (*περί της ὕλης*, from which we have a considerable extract, in *Euseb.*, Præpar. Evang., vi., 22); *Candidus* and *Ap-pion* explained the Hexaëmeron, or six days' work, Gen., ch. i.; *Sextus* wrote on the resurrection; and *Arabianus* composed some doctrinal tracts.

Judas, of the same age, undertook a computation of the 70 weeks of Daniel; and brought down his history of events to A.D. 203. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 52, and *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 7.

Ammonius was probably an Egyptian Christian, nearly contemporary with *Origen*; and not the apostate philosopher *Ammonius Saccus* under whom *Origen* studied, though confounded with him by *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 19, and by *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 55. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., iv., p. 161 and 172, and *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christianor., p. 281, &c. He wrote a book on the agreement of Moses with Jesus, which is lost, and a Harmony of the four Gospels, which is supposed to be one of those still extant in the Biblioth. Max. Patrum. But whether the larger Harmony, in tom. ii., pt. ii., or the smaller, in tom. iii., is the genuine work, has been doubted. See *Lardner*, Credibility, &c., pt. ii., vol. ii., p. 106, &c.

Tryphon, a disciple of *Origen*, is said by *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr., c. 57) to have been very learned in the scriptures, and to have written many epistles and tracts, and particularly a treatise concerning the red heifer, in the book of Num., ch. xix.; and another, on the dividing of the birds, in Abraham's sacrifice, Gen. xv., 10. Nothing of his is extant.

Symmachus, originally a Samaritan, then a Jew, and at last an Ebionite Christian, gave a free translation of the O. T. into Greek; and also defended the principles of the Ebionites, in a Commentary on Matthew's Gospel. See *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 17.

Narcissus was made bp. of Jerusalem A.D. 196. After four years of faithful service, he was falsely accused of immoral conduct; and, though generally accounted innocent, he voluntarily abdicated his office, and lived in retirement till A.D. 216, when he resumed his office and continued in it till his martyrdom, A.D. 237. It is stated, that he was then 116 years old. See *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., c. 9, 10, 11.

Alexander succeeded *Narcissus*, A.D. 237, and held the chair 14 years. This eminent man was bishop of a church in Cappadocia, when called to the see of Jerusalem. He was a great patron of *Origen*; and wrote several epistles, from which extracts are preserved. After important services to the church, he died a martyr, A.D. 251. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 62, and *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 11, 14, 19, 26, 39, and 46.

Firmilian, bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, was a disciple and a great admirer of *Origen*. He was a man of high eminence in the church, and died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council of Antioch against *Paul* of Samosata, about A.D. 266. A long and able epistle of his to *Cyprian*, on the rebaptism of Heretics, is preserved in a Latin translation, among the works of *Cyprian*, Ep. 75. See *Euseb.*, H. E., vi., 26, 27, 46, and vii., 5, 29.

Pontius, a deacon of Carthage, attended *Cyprian* at his death, and wrote an account of his martyrdom, which has reached us, though perhaps interpolated. It is prefixed to *Cyprian's* works, and is found in *Ruinart*, Acta Selecta Martyrum. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 68.—*Pontius* himself, it is said, suffered martyrdom shortly after; of which an account is extant, professedly written by his fellow-deacon *Valerius*; apud *Baluzii* Miscell., tom. ii., p. 124.

Cornelius, bp. of Rome, was elected June 2, A.D. 251, in opposition to *Novatian*; and after 15 months, died in banishment at Centumcellæ, (Civita-Vecchia), Sept. 14, A.D. 252. In the works of *Cyprian*, there are extant two epistles of *Cornelius* to *Cyprian*, and ten ep. of *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*. *Cyprian* describes him (Ep. 52, ed. Baluz.) as an unimpeachable character, a pious, sensible, modest man, well qualified to be a bishop. *Jerome*, (de Viris Illustr., c. 66), mentions four epistles of *Cornelius* to *Fabius* bp. of Antioch; and *Euseb.* gives us a long and valuable extract from one of them, H. E., vi., 43.—See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.

Novatian, first a presbyter, and then the schismatical bp. of Rome, wrote, (according to *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 70), de Pascha; de Sabbatho; de Circumcisione; de Sacerdote; de Oratione; de Cibis Judaicis, (extant, inter Opp. *Tertulliana*); de Instantia; de Attalo; de Trinitate, (a large book, being an abridgment of a work of *Tertullian*, extant, inter Opp. *Tertul*), and many other works. An epistle written by him to *Cyprian*, in the name of the Roman clergy, A.D. 250, is likewise extant, (inter Opp. *Cypriani*, ep. 31, ed. Baluz.), and shows that he

was a man of talents, and a good writer. His rival, *Cornelius*, describes him as a very bad man; see *Euseb.*, H. E., vii., 43.

Stephen, bp. of Rome, A.D. 253-257, is chiefly famous for his presumptuous attempt to excommunicate *Cyprian* and many other bishops of Africa and the East, for rebaptizing converted heretics. See *Euseb.*, Hist. Eccl., vii., 2-5, 7. *Cyprian*, Ep. 70-75. *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.

Sixtus II., bp. of Rome A.D. 257, 258, and a martyr, was more conciliatory than his predecessor. *Euseb.*, vii., 5, 9; *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.—Various supposititious writings are extant under his name. The most noted is a series of 460 moral Apothegms, translated by *Rufinus*. *Jerome*, (on Ezek., c. 18, and elsewhere), and *Augustine*, (Retract., l. ii., c. 42), pronounce them the work of *Sixtus*, a pagan philosopher; which they probably are, notwithstanding *U. G. Sieber*, their editor, (Lips., 1725, 4to), has laboured hard to fix them on this Roman bishop.

Dionysius, bp. of Rome A.D. 259-269, was a learned man, and a good bishop. See *Basil*, ep. 220, and de Sp. Sancto, c. 29. *Euseb.*, H. E., vii., 7. He wrote an ep. against the Sabellians, of which *Athanasius* (de Synodi Nicaenae Decretis) has preserved an extract; also an ep. to *Dionysius* of Alexandria, acquainting him with the dissatisfaction of a council of bishops at Rome, with some expressions concerning the Trinity used by that patriarch, and requesting of him an explanation; which was given in four Letters or Books. *Athanasius*, pro sententia Dionys. Alex., and *Euseb.*, H. E., vii., 26.—See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. i.

Malchion, a presbyter and a teacher of philosophy at Antioch. He greatly distinguished himself in the third council against *Paul* of Samosata, A.D. 269. Two previous councils had been unable to convict the crafty heretic; but in this, *Malchion* encountered him in presence of the council, while stenographers took down their dialogue. *Paul* was now convicted; and the Dialogue was published. *Eusebius*, H. E., vii., 29. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 71.

Commodianus, a Christian poet, was probably an African and contemporary, or nearly so, with *Cyprian*. See *Dodwell's* Diss. de ætate Commodiani. He had a smattering of Greek and Latin learning; but was a weak, though well-meaning man. His book comprises eighty paragraphs, called Instructions. It is written acrostically, and in a loose kind of hexameter. The style is rude, and the matter trite. The first half of the book is directed against the pagans; next he assails the unbelieving Jews; and then at,

tempts to instruct all classes of Christians, and all ranks of ecclesiastical functionaries. It was first published by *Rigaltius*, subjoined to *Cyprian's* works, A.D. 1650; and again in 1666. The editions with notes, by *Schurtzfleisch*, 1710, and of *Davis*, subjoined to his *Minutius Felix*, Cambr., 1711, 8vo, are the best.

Anatolius, a very scientific ecclesiastic of Alexandria, who, by his address, once delivered his townsman from a siege. He was made bishop of Laodicea in Syria, about A.D. 270, and published *canons* for ascertaining Easter, from which *Eusebius*, (H. E., vii., 32), has preserved an extract; and *Institutes of Arithmetic*, in ten books, of which some fragments still remain.—*Eusebius* (l. c.) gives a long account of him. See also *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 73.—What remains of his works, has been published, Gr. and Lat., by *Bucherius*, in his *Doctrina Temporum*, Antw., 1634, fol.

Archelaus, bishop of Carrha in Mesopotamia, flourished about A.D. 278. He wrote in Syriac his disputation with *Manes* the heretic; which was early translated into Greek, and thence into Latin. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 72. A large part of the Latin copy, was first published by *Valesius*, subjoined to *Socrates*, *Historia Eccles.*, afterwards, together with what remains of the Greek, by *Zaccagnius*, in his *Collection* of rare works of the Greek and Latin church, Rome, 1698, 4to, p. 1–102: and lastly, by *Fabricius*, ad finem Opp. S. Hippolyti, 2 vols. fol.

Pierius, a presbyter, and perhaps, catechist of Alexandria. He was of *Origen's* school, very learned in the Scriptures, and wrote many discourses and expositions in a neat and simple style. He was called *Origen Junior*. His long discourse on the prophet Hosea, is particularly noticed by *Jerome*. *Photius* (Biblioth. cxix.) mentions twelve books of his expositions. He was of an ascetic turn, lived considerably into the fourth century, and spent his latter years at Rome. Nothing of his remains. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 76, and *Eusebius*, H. E., vii., 32.

Theognostus, of Alexandria, a friend of *Origen*, and perhaps successor to *Pierius* in the catechetical school. He wrote seven books of Hypotyposes; of which *Photius* (Biblioth. cvi.) has preserved an abstract. *Photius* deemed him heretical, in regard to the Trinity: but *Athanasius* makes quotations from him, in confutation of the Arians. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. ix., p. 408.

Lucian, a learned presbyter of Antioch. He adhered for some time to *Paul* of Samosata. To him most of the churches from

Syria to Constantinople, were indebted for corrected copies of the Septuagint. *Jerome* mentions him as the author of several theological tracts and letters; and a confession of faith, drawn up by him, is still extant, in *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 10, and in *Walch's* Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus, p. 29, &c. He was a very pious man, and suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, A.D. 311.—See *Eusebius*, H. E., viii., 13, and ix., 6, and *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 77.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop and martyr, was famous at the same period for setting forth correct copies of the Septuagint in Egypt. Whether he was that *Hesychius*, who compiled a useful Greek Lexicon, still extant, is uncertain. He died a martyr, A.D. 311. See *Euseb.*, H. E., viii., 13, and *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. iv., p. 554, &c.

Pamphylus the martyr, was a native of Berytus, but a presbyter of Cæsarea in Palestine, where he established a school, and collected a theological library, which has been of immense service to the Christian world. This library afforded to *Eusebius*, *Jerome*, and many others, the means of becoming learned divines, and of benefiting the world by their writings. To this establishment, ecclesiastical history and biblical learning, are peculiarly indebted.—*Pamphylus* was a pupil of *Pierius*, an admirer of *Origen*, and the great friend and patron of *Eusebius*. He transcribed most of the works of *Origen*, with his own hand; and he composed a biography and vindication of *Origen*, in five books, to which *Eusebius* added a sixth book. Only the first book is now extant; and that in a Latin translation of *Rufinus*, printed inter Opp. *Origenis*.—*Pamphylus* took great pains to multiply and spread abroad correct copies of the Holy Scriptures.—His life was written by *Eusebius*, in three books, which are lost. He suffered martyrdom, A.D. 299, at Cæsarea in Palestine. See *Eusebius*, de martyribus Palæstinæ, c. 10 and 7, and H. E., vi., 32, vii., 32, and viii., 13. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 75.

Victorinus, bishop of Petavio in Upper Pannonia, (Petau in Steyermark,) wrote Commentaries on Gen., Exod., Levit., Isa., Ezek., Habak., Eccles., Cantic., and the Apocalypse; also a book against all the Heresies. He died a martyr, A.D. 303. *Jerome* says, he understood Greek better than Latin; and therefore his thoughts are good, but his style bad.—*Dr. Cave* (Hist. Lit., vol. i.) published a fragment of his Commentary on Genesis. Whether the Commentary on the Apocalypse, now extant under his name, be *his*, has been much doubted; because this comment is opposed to Chiliasm, whereas *Jerome* (de Viris Illustr.,

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of Christian Theology.—§ 2. Sources of the Mystical Theology.—§ 3. Thence the Monks and Eremites.—§ 4. Attention to the Holy Scriptures.—§ 5. *Origen's* Principles of Interpretation.—§ 6. Other Interpreters.—§ 7. State of Dogmatic Theology.—§ 8. Moral or Practical Theology.—§ 9. Polemic Divines.—§ 10. Faults of the Disputants.—§ 11. Spurious Books.—§ 12. The Chiliastic Controversy.—§ 13. Controversy respecting the Baptism of Reclaimed Heretics.—§ 14. Disputes concerning *Origen*.

§ 1. To the common people, the principal truths of Christianity were explained in their purity and simplicity, and all subtleties were avoided; nor were weak and tender minds overloaded with a multitude of precepts. (1) But in their schools, and in their books, the doctors who cultivated literature and philosophy and especially those of Egypt, deemed it elegant and exquisite, to subject divine wisdom to the scrutiny of reason, or rather to bring under the precepts of their philosophy, and to examine metaphysically, the nature of the doctrines taught by *Christ*. At the head of this class of divines was *Origen*, who being fascinated with the Platonic philosophy, ventured to apply its laws to every part of religion, and persuaded himself that the philosophy which he admired, could assign the causes and grounds of every doctrine, and determine its precise form and nature. (2)

c. 18) says, that Victorinus *favoured* the sentiments of *Nepos* and the Chiliasts.—See *Jerome*, de Viris Illust., c. 74.—*Tr.*]

(1) See *Origen*, in Præf. libr. de Principiis, tom. i., Opp., p. 49, and lib. i., de Princip., cap. vii., p. 69, ed. de la Rue; also *Gregory* Neocæsar. Expositio Fidei, p. 11, Opp., ed. G. Vossii.

(2) In his *Stromata*, which are lost, and in his work de *Principiis*, which is preserved in the Latin translation of *Rufinus* —[See a long note of Dr. *Mosheim*, on the philosophy and the theology of *Origen*, in his Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 604, &c.—It does not appear that *Origen* regarded reason or philosophy as of higher authority than revelation. He believed indeed that there is a true philosophy as well as a false, and that the dictates of the former are to be received and confided in. But he also believed that the scriptures contain a divine revelation, which is to be received and followed with implicit confidence; and that no philosophy is true which contradicts the plain declarations of the scriptures. At the same time he believed, that the scriptures for the most part only state the simple truths and facts of religion, without explaining the grounds and reasons of them; and that they state these truths and facts in a plain and popular man-

ner, without acquainting us with the metaphysical nature of the subjects. In his opinion, it was the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate more fully the causes and grounds of these religious truths and facts, and to examine and determine their metaphysical nature.—Such, it appears, were *Origen's* fundamental principles. And how few are they, who in this or in any age, have adopted more consistent views? Yet he erred; and erred, just as theologians have ever been prone to do, by relying too confidently on the correctness and certainty of what he regarded as the conclusions of true philosophy. For an illustration of the nature and extent of *Origen's* errors, let it be observed, that in the beginning of his book de *Principiis*, § 3, p. 47, he gives the following list of fundamental truths, which he considers as plainly taught in the scriptures, and of course as never to be called in question; viz. (1) There is one God, the creator and father of all. (2) He, in these last days, sent *Christ* to call first the Jews and then also other people. (3) *Jesus Christ* was begotten of the Father before all creatures, and he aided (was the instrument of) the Father in the whole work of creation. (4) The same *Christ* becoming man, was incarnate, though he was God; and having

He must be acknowledged, indeed, to have proceeded in this matter, for the most part, with timidity and modesty; but his example sanctioned this faulty mode of treating theology, and led his disciples to burst the barriers he established, and to become very licentious in explaining divine truths according to the dictates of philosophy. To these divines as the parents, that species of *theology* which is called philosophic or *scholastic*, owes its birth; but it afterwards assumed various forms, according to the capacity and erudition of the men who delighted in it.

§ 2. It is a singular circumstance, that another species of *theology* which has been denominated *mystic*, and which has a natural tendency to destroy the former, originated from the same sources, and nearly at the same time. Its authors are unknown; but its causes and the process of its formation are manifest. Its originators assumed that well-known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was approved also by *Origen* and his followers, that *a portion of the divine nature was diffused through all human souls*; or to express the same thing in other words, that *reason in us is an emanation from God himself, and comprehends the elements or first principles of all truths human and divine*. Yet they denied that men, by their own efforts and care, can excite this divine spark within them; and therefore they disapproved of the endeavours of men to gain clear perceptions of latent truths by means of definitions, discrimination, and reflection. On the contrary they maintained, that silence, inaction, solitude, repose, the avoidance of all active scenes, and the mortification and subjugation of the body, tended to excite this *internal word* [*λόγος* or *reason*] to put forth its hidden energies, and thus to instruct men in divine things. For the men who neglect all human affairs, and withdraw their senses and their eyes from the contagious influence of material objects, do spiritually, or with the mind, return back to God; and being united with God, they not only enjoy vast pleasure, but they see in its native purity and undisguised that truth, which appears to others only in a vitiated and deformed state. (3)

become man, he remained God, as he was before; he assumed a body like to ours, and differing only in this, that it was born of the virgin and of the Holy Spirit; he really and truly suffered, died, and rose again. (5) The Holy Spirit, in honour and dignity, is joined with the Father and the Son. (6) All rational minds possess entire freedom of choice and volition, and when separated from the body will be punished or rewarded according to their merits. (7) Our bodies will be raised in a far more perfect state. (8) The devil and his angels are realities, and they seek to involve men in sin. (9) This world will be dissolved. (10) The scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God; and they contain a double sense, the one manifest, the other latent. (11) There are holy angels and powers, who minister to the salvation of men. These *Origen* gives as *specimens* only; for he says: *Hæ sunt species (sorts or specimens) eorum, quæ per prædicationem Apostolicam manifeste traduntur*. Now such general truths as these, *Origen* did not permit to be called in ques-

tion for a moment. Yet, as before observed, their metaphysical nature and the grounds and reasons of them, he supposed it the proper business of reason or philosophy to investigate. And his errors were nearly all in relation to religious philosophy, or ontology and metaphysics. He reasoned, and believed, according to the reigning philosophy of the age and country in which he lived. He therefore believed in the pre-existence of human souls, and their incarceration in bodies, for offences previously committed; that the senses are polluting to the soul, and must be all mortified; that all rational beings are left of God to follow their own choice, and are restrained only by motives, the most powerful of which is punishment; and that ultimately God will thus bring all his creatures to be wise and holy and happy. —*Tr.*]

(3) [In his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.*, p. 658–667, Dr. *Mosheim* endeavours to show, that *Origen*, by his religious philosophy, laid the foundations of mystic theology in the Christian church. But the evi-

§ 3. By such reasoning many in this age were induced to retire into deserts, and to emaciate their bodies by fasting and hardships. And by such motives, rather than by fear of the Decian persecution, I suppose *Paul* the hermit was led to roam in the deserts of Thebais, and to lead a life more proper for an irrational animal than for a human being.(4) This *Paul* is said to be the author of the institution of Eremites. But this mode of life prevailed among Christians long before *Paul* the hermit; in fact it was practised long before the Christian era, in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia, and it still exists among the Mohammedans, no less than among the Christians, in those arid and burning climates.(5) For the heated atmosphere which overspreads those countries naturally disposes the inhabitants to repose and indolence, and to court solitude and melancholy.

§ 4. Among those who laudably employed themselves on the sacred volume, the first place is due to those who took earnest care, that copies of the Bible might everywhere be found accurately written and at a moderate price; that it might be translated into other languages, and that amended and faultless editions might become common. Many opulent Christians of those times are known to have expended no small portion of their estates in furtherance of these objects. In correcting the copies of the Septuagint version, *Pierius* and *Hesychias* in Egypt, and *Lucian* at Antioch, employed themselves with laudable industry. Nor should the nearly similar efforts of *Pamphylus* the martyr, be passed without notice. But *Origen* surpassed all others in diligence and patient labour in this way. His *Hexapla*, though [nearly] destroyed by the ravages of time, will remain an eternal monument of the incredible application, with which that great man laboured to subserve the interests of the church.(6)

dence he adduces is by no means conclusive.
—Tr.]

(4) His life was written by *Jerome*. [See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, Antwerp, tom. i., January 10, p. 602 —*Schl.*]

(5) See the *Travels of Paul Lucas*, A.D. 1714, vol. ii. p. 363. [The reader will recollect the *Dervises* and *Fakirs*, who roam over the whole country from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Ganges.—*Jerome* reports, in the preface to his life of *Paul* of Thebais, on the questionable authority of *Amathas* and *Macarius*, two disciples of *St. Anthony*, that *Paul* the hermit of Thebais, was the first who practised this mode of life. But high ideas of the sanctity of renouncing social and civilized life and dwelling in deserts among beasts, were prevalent, before the middle of this century, when *Paul* turned hermit. Thus *Narcissus*, bishop of Jerusalem, obtained great reputation in the close of the second century, by secreting himself many years in the desert. *Eusebius*, H. E., lib. vi., c. 9, 10. The origin of religious eremitism may perhaps be traced back to the early pagan philosophers; for *Porphyry* (περί ἀποχῆς, § 35) assures us, that the ancient *Pythagoreans* were distinguished for their attachment to this mode of life.—Tr.]

(6) The fragments of this Hereulean work which are preserved, have been collected and published by that ornament of the once learned Benedictines, *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Paris, 1713, 2 vols. fol. See also *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii., p. 1376, &c., and *J. G. Carpzov*, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, p. 574.—[*Origen* published both a *Tetrapla* and a *Hexapla*, that is, a fourfold and a sixfold Bible. The former contained, in parallel columns (1) *Aquila's* Gr. version; (2) that of *Symmachus*; (3) the Septuagint version; (4) the Gr. version of *Theodotion*. The *Hexapla* contained, throughout, six columns, generally eight, and occasionally nine; thus arranged, (1) The Hebrew text in the Hebrew character; (2) the Hebrew text in Greek characters; (3) *Aquila's* version; (4) that of *Symmachus*; (5) the Septuagint; (6) that of *Theodotion*; (7) and (8) two other Greek versions, whose authors were unknown; (9) another Greek version. The three last, being anonymous versions, are denominated the *Fifth*, *Sixth*, and *Seventh* Greek versions.—The most useful parts of *Montfaucon's* *Hexapla*, with additions, corrections, and notes, have been published in two vols. 8vo, by *C. F. Bahrdt*, Lips., 1769–70. Tr.]

§ 5. The same *Origen*, unquestionably, stands at the head of the interpreters of the Bible in this century. But with pain it must be added, he was first among those who have found in the scriptures a secure retreat for all errors and idle fancies. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that is said in the Scriptures, against the cavils of the heretics and the enemies of Christianity, provided he interpreted the language of the Bible literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume in the way in which the Platonists were accustomed to explain the history of their gods. He therefore taught, that the words, in many parts of the Bible, convey no meaning at all; and in some places, where he acknowledged there was some meaning in the words, he maintained that under the things there expressed, there was contained a hidden and concealed sense, which was much to be preferred to the literal meaning of the words.(7) And this hidden sense it is, that he searches

(7) Here may be consulted the Preface of *Charles de la Rue* to the second volume of *Origen's* works, ed. Paris, 1733, fol. With greater fullness and precision I have stated and explained Origen's system of biblical interpretation, in my Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 629, &c., where also his philosophy, his theology, and his contest with Bishop *Demetrius*, are formally taken up and discussed.—[With this may be compared the observations of that distinguished philologist, Professor *Ernesti*, in his *Dissertatio de Origene, interpretationis librorum S. S. grammaticæ auctore*, written A.D. 1756. *Ernesti* shows that the merits of this Christian father, in regard to the criticism and exposition of the O. and N. Testaments, were by no means small.—The leading thoughts of *Dr. Mosheim*, as stated in his *Commentaries de Rebus*, &c., are the following. *Origen* was not the inventor of the allegorical mode of expounding the Scriptures. It was in use among the Jews, before the Christian era. (*Ernesti* goes farther, and seeks its origin in the schools of the prophets). *Philo* was a great allegorist, and *Pantæus* and *Clemens Alex* were the first Christian allegorists. *Origen* took greater liberties in this mode of interpretation; and it was not simply his resorting to allegories, but his excesses in them, that drew upon him enemies. Before his day, all interpreters explained the narrations and the laws contained in the Bible, according to their literal meaning. But *Origen* perversely turned a large part of biblical history into moral fables, and many of the laws into allegories. Probably he learned this in the school of *Ammonius*, which expounded Hesiod, Homer, and the whole fabulous history of the Greeks allegorically. The predecessors of Origen, who searched after a mystical sense of scripture, still set a high value on the grammatical or literal sense; but he often expresses

himself, as if he attached no value to it. Before him, allegories were resorted to, only to discover predictions of future events, and rules for moral conduct: but he betook himself to allegories, in order to establish the principles of his philosophy on a scriptural basis. All this must have been offensive to many Christians. His propensity to allegories must be ascribed to the fertility of his invention, the prevailing custom of the Egyptians, his education, the instructions he received from his teachers, and the example both of the philosophers, of whom he was an admirer, and of the Jews, especially *Philo*. To these may be added other causes. He hoped, by means of his allegories, more easily to convince the Jews, to confute the Gnostics, and to silence the objections of both. This he himself tells us, de Principiis, l. viii., c. 8, p. 164, &c. But we must not forget his attachment to that system of philosophy which he embraced. This philosophy could not be reconciled with the Scriptures, except by a resort to allegories; and therefore the Scriptures must be interpreted allegorically, that they might not contradict his philosophy. The Platonic idea of a twofold world, a visible and an invisible, the one emblematic of the other, led him to search for a figurative description of the invisible world, in the biblical history of the nations of the earth. He also believed that it was doing honour to the Holy Scriptures, to consider them as diverse from all human compositions, and as containing hidden mysteries. See his Homil. xv., on Genesis, Opp., tom. ii., p. 99, and Homil. on Exod., Opp., tom. ii., p. 129. And finally, he thought many of the objections of the enemies of religion, could not be fully answered, without recurrence to allegories.—His general principles for the interpretation of the sacred volume, resolve themselves into the following positions. (1) The Scriptures resemble man-

after in his commentaries, ingeniously indeed, but perversely, and generally to the entire neglect and contempt of the literal meaning. (8) This remote sense he moreover divides into the *moral*, and the *mystical* or *spiritual*; the former containing instruction relative to the internal state of the soul and

As a man consists of three parts, a rational mind, a sensitive soul, and a visible body; so the Scriptures have a threefold sense, a *literal* sense, corresponding with the body, a *moral* sense, analogous to the soul, and a *mystical* or *spiritual* sense, analogous to the rational mind. Homil. v., on Levit., § 5, Opp., tom. ii., p. 209.—(2) As the body is the baser part of man, so the *literal* is the less worthy sense of Scripture. And as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the *literal* sense often leads us into error. Stromata, l. x., quoted by Jerome, b. iii. Comment. on Galat., ch. iii., Opp., tom. i., p. 41. (3) Yet the *literal* sense is not wholly useless. De Principiis, l. iv., § 12, p. 169, and § 14, p. 173.—(4) They who would see farther into the Scriptures than the common people, must search out the *moral* sense. (5) And the perfect, or those who have attained to the highest degree of blessedness, must also investigate the *spiritual* sense. De Principiis, l. iv., § 2, p. 168.—(6) The *moral* sense of Scripture instructs us relative to the changes in the mind of man, and gives rules for regulating the heart and life. (7) The *spiritual* sense acquaints us with the nature and state and history of the *spiritual* world. For, besides this material world, there is a spiritual world, composed of two parts, the heavenly and the earthly. The *earthly* mystical or spiritual world, is the Christian church on earth. The *heavenly* mystical world is above, and corresponds in all its parts with the lower world, which was formed after its model. (8) As the Scripture contains the history of this twofold mystic world, so there is a twofold mystic sense of Scripture, an *allegorical* and an *anagogical*. (9) The *mystic* sense is diffused throughout the Holy Scriptures. (10) Yet we do not always meet with *both* the *allegorical* sense and the *anagogical*, in every passage. (11) The *moral* sense likewise pervades the whole Bible. (12) But the *literal* sense does not occur everywhere: for many passages have no literal meaning. (13) Some passages have only *two* senses, namely, a *moral* and a *mystical*, [the *mystical* being either *allegorical* or *anagogical*, rarely both], other passages have *three* senses, [the *moral*, the *mystical*, and the *literal*.] (14) The *literal* sense is perceived by every attentive reader. The *moral* sense is somewhat more difficult to be discovered. (15) But the *mystic* sense none can discover, with certainty, unless they are wise men, and

also taught of God. (16) Neither can even such men hope to fathom all the mysteries of the sacred volume. (17) In searching for the *anagogical* sense, especially, a person must proceed with peculiar care and caution.—Schl. Dr. Mosheim states the following as Origen's general rule for determining when a passage of scripture may be taken literally, and when not; viz., Whenever the words, if understood literally, will afford a valuable meaning, one that is worthy of God, useful to men, and accordant with truth and correct reason, then the literal meaning is to be retained: but whenever the words, if understood literally, will express what is absurd, or false, or contrary to correct reason, or useless, or unworthy of God, then the *literal* sense is to be discarded, and the *moral* and *mystical* alone to be regarded.—This rule he applies to every part both of the Old Test. and the New. And he assigns two reasons why fables and literal absurdities are admitted into the sacred volume. The *first* is, that if the literal meaning were always rational and good, the reader would be apt to rest in it, and not look after the *moral* and *mystical* sense. The *second* is, that fabulous and incongruous representations often afford *moral* and *mystical* instruction, which could not so well be conveyed by sober facts and representations. De Principiis, l. iv., § 15, 16; tom. x., Comment. in Joh.—Tr.]

(8) Origen, in his Stromata, l. x., cited by Ch. de la Rue, Opp., tom. i., p. 41, says: Multorum malorum occasio est, si quis in carne Scripturæ maneat. Quæ qui fecerint, regnum Dei non consequentur. Quamobrem spiritum Scripturæ fructusque queramus, qui non dicuntur manifesti. He had said a little before: Non valde eos juvat Scriptura, qui eam intelligunt, ut scriptum est. Who would suppose such declarations could fall from the lips of a wise and considerate person? But this excellent man suffered himself to be misled by the causes mentioned, and by his love of philosophy. He could not discover in the sacred books all that he considered true, so long as he adhered to the *literal* sense; but allow him to abandon the *literal* sense, and to search for recondite meanings, and those books would contain Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and the whole tribe of philosophers. And thus, nearly all those who would model Christianity according to their own fancy or their favourite system of philosophy, have run into this mode of interpreting Scripture.

our external actions, and the latter acquainting us with the nature, the history, and laws of the *spiritual* or *mystical world*. He fancied that this *mystical world* was also twofold, partly *superior* or *celestial*, and partly *inferior* and *terrestrial*, that is, the church; and hence he divided the mystical sense of scripture into the terrene or *allegorical*, and the celestial or *anagogical*. This mode of interpreting scripture, which was sanctioned by Jewish practice, was current among Christians before the times of *Origen*. But as he gave determinate rules for it, and brought it into a systematic form, he is commonly regarded as its originator.

§ 6. Innumerable expositors in this and the following centuries, pursued the method of *Origen*, though with some diversity; nor could the few who pursued a better method, make much head against them. The commentaries of *Hippolytus*, which have reached us, show that this holy man went wholly into *Origen's* method. And no better, probably, were the expositions of some books of the Old and New Testaments, composed by *Victorinus*, but which are now lost. But the Paraphrase on the book of Ecclesiastes, by *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, which is still extant, is not liable to the same objection, although its author was a great admirer of *Origen*. *Methodius* explained the book of Genesis, and the Canticles; but his labours have not reached us. *Ammonius* composed a Harmony of the gospels.

§ 7. *Origen*, in his lost work entitled *Stromata*, and in his four Books de Principiis, explained most of the doctrines of Christianity, or, to speak more correctly, deformed them with philosophical speculations. And these his Books de Principiis were the first compendium of scholastic—or, if you please—philosophic theology. Something similar was attempted by *Theognostus*, in his seven Books of *Hypotyposes*; for a knowledge of which we are indebted to *Photius*,⁽⁹⁾ who says, they were the work of a man infected with the opinions of *Origen*. *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, in his *Expositio Fidei*, gave a brief summary of Christian doctrines. Certain points of the Christian faith were taken up by various individuals, in reply to the enemies or the corrupters of Christianity. Tracts on the Deity, the resurrection, antichrist, and the end of the world, were composed by *Hippolytus*. *Methodius* wrote on free will; and *Lucian* on the creed. But as most of these treatises are no longer extant, their character is little known.

§ 8. Among the writers on moral subjects, (or practical theology), passing by *Tertullian*, who was mentioned under the preceding century, the first place belongs perhaps to *Cyprian*. From the pen of this extraordinary man, we have treatises on the *advantages of patience*, on *mortality*, on *alms and good works*, and an *exhortation to martyrdom*. In these works there are many excellent thoughts, but they are not arranged neatly and happily, nor sustained by solid arguments.⁽¹⁰⁾ *Origen* wrote, among other works of a practical nature, an *exhortation to martyrdom*; a topic discussed by many in that age, with different degrees of eloquence and perspicacity. *Methodius* treated of chastity, but in a confused manner, in his

(9) [*Photius*, Biblioth., cod. cvi., p. 279. *Photius* represents him as erring, with *Origen*, in regard to the character of the Son of God. But *G. Bull* defends him against this charge, in his *Defensio Fidei Nicaenae*, sec. 2, c. 10, § 7, p. 135.—See concerning

him, *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., l. v., c. 1, vol. v., p. 276, and l. v., c. 38, vol. ix., p. 408.—*Schl.*]

(10) See *J. Barbeyrac*, de la Morale des Peres, c. viii., p. 104, &c.

Feast of Virgins. *Dionysius* of Alexandria wrote on *penance* and on *temptations*. To mention other writers in this department would be needless.

§ 9. Of polemic writers, a host might be mentioned. The idolaters were assailed by *Minucius Felix*, in his dialogue entitled *Octavius*; by *Origen*, in his eight Books *against Celsus*; by *Arnobius*, in his seven Books *against the Gentiles*; and by *Cyprian*, in his tract *on the Vanity of Idols*. The Chronicon of *Hippolytus*, written against the Gentiles, and the work of *Methodius* in opposition to *Porphry*, who attacked Christianity, are lost. We may also place among polemic writers, both those who wrote against the philosophers, as *Hippolytus*, who wrote against *Plato*; and those who treated of *fate*, of *free will*, and of the *Origin of Evil*, as *Hippolytus*, *Methodius*, and others. Against the Jews, *Hippolytus* attempted something, which has not reached us; but the *Testimonies* [from scripture] *against the Jews* by *Cyprian*, are still extant. Against all the sectarians and heretics, assaults were made by *Origen*, *Victorinus*, and *Hippolytus*; but nothing of these works has come down to us. It would be superfluous here to enumerate those who wrote against individual heretics.

§ 10. But it must by no means pass unnoticed, that the discussions instituted against the opposers of Christianity in this age, departed far from the primitive simplicity, and the correct method of controversy. For the Christian doctors, who were in part educated in the schools of rhetoricians and sophists, inconsiderately transferred the arts of these teachers to the cause of Christianity; and therefore considered it of no importance, whether an antagonist were confounded by base artifices, or by solid arguments. Thus that mode of disputing, which the ancients called *economical*, (11) and which had victory rather than truth for its object, was almost universally approved. And the Platonists contributed to the currency of the practice, by asserting that it was no sin for a person to employ falsehood and fallacies for the support of truth, when it was in danger of being borne down. A person ignorant of these facts will be but a poor judge of the arguments of *Origen*, in his book *against Celsus*, and of the others who wrote against the worshippers of idols. *Tertullian's* method of confuting heretics, namely, by *prescription*, was not perhaps altogether unsuitable in that age. But they who think it always proper to reason in this manner, must have little knowledge of the difference which time and change of circumstances produce. (12)

(11) *Souverain*, Platonisme dévoilé, p. 244. *J. Duillè*, de vero usu Patrum, l. i., p. 160. *J. C. Wolfii*, Casauboniana, p. 100. On the phrase, *to do a thing κατ' ὀκονομίαν*, *Thø Gataker* has treated largely, in his Notes on *M. Antoninus*, l. xi., p. 330, &c. [It signifies to do a thing *artfully and dexterously*, or *with cunning and sagacity*, as a *shrewd manager* of a household (*ὀκονόμος*) controls those under him. See note 4, p. 128.—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de Præscriptione in rebus Fidei; Opp., tom. iii., p. 1079.—[*Tertullian's* book was entitled de Præscriptione hæreticorum, or Præscriptio-nibus adversus hæreticos; which might be translated, on the *Presumption* in regard to

heretics, or *Presumptions* against them. The author attempts to confute all the heretics at once, and by means of an historical argument. He maintains that the orthodox churches were founded by the apostles and their approved assistants, who ordained the first pastors of these churches, and established in them all, one and the same faith, which must of course be genuine Christianity; and that this faith, having been handed down pure and uncorrupted, is now contained in the creeds and inculcated in the assemblies of these churches. But that not one of these things can be said of the heretical churches, which had not such an origin, and embrace various differing creeds, and creeds derived from other sources. Being bred an advo-

§ 11. This vicious inclination to circumvent and confound an adversary, rather than confute him with sound argument, produced also a multitude of books falsely bearing on their front the names of certain distinguished men. For the greater part of mankind, being influenced more by the authority of names, than by arguments and scripture testimony, the writers conceived they must prefix names of the greatest weight to their books, in order to oppose successfully their adversaries. Hence those *canons* which were falsely ascribed to the apostles: (13) hence those *Apostolic Constitutions*, which *Clemens Romanus* was reputed to have collected: (14) hence too, the *Recognitions of Clement*, (15) as they are called, and the *Clementina*, (16) and other works of the like character, which a too credulous world long held in high estimation. By the same artifice, the *Mystics*, as they are called, sought to advance their cause. Having no answer to give to those who demanded, who was the first author of this new sort of wisdom, they alleged that they received it from *Dionysius*, the Areopagite of Athens, a contemporary with the apostles; and to give plausibility to the falsehood, they palmed upon this great man, books void of sense and rationality. (17) Thus they who wished to surpass all others in piety, deemed it a pious act to employ deception and fraud in support of piety.

cate, and familiar with the proceedings of courts, he gives a forensic form to his argument, not only by using the law term *Præscriptio*, but by maintaining that the orthodox were, and had always been, in right and lawful possession of that invaluable treasure, true Christianity; and that of course, the heretics, who were never in possession of it, in vain attempt now to *oust* them of what they thus hold by legal prescription.—*Tr.*]

(13) [The *Apostolic Canons* are eighty-five ecclesiastical laws or rules, professedly enacted by the apostles, and collected and preserved by *Clemens Romanus*. The matter of them is ancient; for they describe the customs and institutions of Christians, particularly of the Greek and Oriental churches, in the *second* and *third* centuries. But the phraseology indicates a compiler living in the *third* century. See *W. Beveridge's* notes on these canons, and his *Codex canonum eccles. primitivæ vindicatus et illustrat.*, London, 1678, 4to.—*Schl.*]

(14) [The *Apostolic Constitutions* fill eight books. They prescribe the constitution, organization, discipline, and worship of the church, with great particularity; and avowedly are the work of the apostles themselves. But they are supposed to have been compiled in the eastern or Greek church, in the latter part of the *third* or beginning of the *fourth* century. Some place them in the fourth or fifth century. They bear marks of an Arian hand. As describing the form, discipline, and ceremonies of the church about the year 300, they are of considerable value. These constitutions may be seen in *Cotelierii Patres Apostolici*, tom. ii., and in

Wm. Whiston's Primitive Christianity Revived, Lond., 1711, 4 vols. 8vo, where much learned labour is wasted in the vain attempt to prove them to be "the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Test."—*Tr.*]

(15) [The *Recognitions*, of which we have only the Latin translation of *Rufinus*, compose ten books, and describe the travels of the apostle *Peter*, and his contests with *Simon Magus*. The work is a pleasant one to read, and helps us to understand the doctrines of the Gnostics. *Dr. Mosheim*, (*Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia*, § 34), conjectures, with much probability, that it was composed by an Alexandrian Jew, who was opposed to the Gnostics, but himself full of errors, under the forged name of *Clemens Romanus*.—*Schl.*]

(16) [The *Clementina* are nineteen Homilies, first published, Gr. and Lat., by *Cotelier*, in his *Patres Apostol.*, tom. i., p. 603, &c. They are supposed to have been the work of some Ebionite.—*Schl.* The *Clementina* and the *Recognitions* are works of a similar character. Both profess to give us the history of *St. Peter's* contests with *Simon Magus*, and his private instructions to his particular friends, respecting the mysteries of nature and the deep things of theology. They are downright romance; yet not uninteresting, as specimens of the speculations of semi-Christians of a philosophic turn, who lived about A.D. 200.—*Tr.*]

(17) [The spurious works ascribed to *Dionysius* the Areopagite, (who is mentioned Acts xvii., 34), are the following: *de Cœlesti Hierarchia*, lib. i.; *de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, l. i.; *de Divinis Nominibus*, l. i.;

§ 12. Among the controversies which divided Christians in this century, the most considerable were, concerning the *millennium*, the *baptism of heretics*, and concerning *Origen*. That the Saviour is to reign a thousand years among men, before the end of the world, had been believed by many in the preceding century, without offence to any: all, however, had not explained the doctrine in the same manner, nor indulged hopes of the same kind of pleasures during that reign. (18) In this century the millenarian doctrine fell into disrepute, through the influence especially of *Origen*, who strenuously opposed it, because it contravened some of his opinions. (19) But *Nepos*, an Egyptian bishop, attempted to revive its au-

de Mystica Theologia, l. i., together with four epistles to *Caius*, one to *Dorotheus*, one to *Sosipater*, one to *Polycarp*, one to *Demophylus*, one to *Titus*, one to *Apollophanes*, and two to *St. John* the apostle. They all relate to mystic theology, and breathe a devout spirit, but are exceedingly obscure and difficult of comprehension. It is supposed they were written in the fourth or fifth century, as they bear marks of that period, and are not mentioned by any writer prior to the sixth century. During the middle ages they were held in high estimation, and their genuineness scarcely if at all questioned. The more devout Catholics and most of the early Protestants, received them and relied upon them as genuine. In the 17th century, their spuriousness was abundantly demonstrated, and they are now universally regarded as supposititious. The best edition of these works, Gr. and Lat., with copious notes, is that of *Balthazar Corderius*, Antwerp, 1634, 2 vols. fol., embracing the Gr. scholia of *St. Maximus* the martyr, (A.D. 659), and the paraphrase of *George Pachymeras*, (A.D. 1280.) The MS. copies of these works are found in most of the great libraries of Europe.—*Tr.*

(18) [“See the learned *Treatise concerning the true millennium*, which *Dr. Whitby* has subjoined to the second volume of his *Commentary upon the New Testament*. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millenarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh, and ninth volumes of *Laclaver's Credibility*, &c.”—*Macl.* Also *H. Corodt's* kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus, 2d ed., 1794, 3 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(19) See *Origen*, de Principiis, lib. ii., c. 11, Opp., tom. i., p. 104, [and Prolog. Comment. in Cantic. Cantico., tom. iii., p. 28.—The *Corinthians*, *Marcomites*, *Montanists*, and *Meletians*, among the heretical sects, and among the orthodox fathers *Papias*, *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, held to a millennial reign of Christ, and *Irenæus* understood it in a very gross sense. *Dr. Mosheim*, in his *Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c.*, p. 721, believed the doctrine had

a Jewish origin; and he supposed the Christian doctors received, or at least tolerated it, because they hoped by it to make the Jews more willing to embrace Christianity. But *Dr. Walch*, in his *Entwurf einer vollständigen Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 143, is more discriminating, and maintains that the question, whether a millennial reign of Christ is to be expected, had a biblical origin, the earlier Chiliasts relying on the testimony of the *Apocalypse*: but the explanation of the doctrine, he admits, was derived from the Jewish opinions. There were two kinds of Chiliasts, the gross and the refined. The latter placed the chief difference between the millennial reign of Christ and his present reign, in the higher enjoyment of spiritual advantages and pleasures, yet without wholly excluding the pleasures of sense. But the former expected, in the millennium, all kinds of sensual delights, and the free indulgence of all, even the most exorbitant lusts. And these gross Chiliasts are to be found not merely among the heretics; they may be found also among the orthodox, as the example of *Irenæus* proves. According to the account of *Gennadius* of Marseilles, de Dogmat. ecclesiast., c. 55, p. 32, the Chiliasts may be divided into four classes. The first class were the most moderate. They are called Meletians; and they expected a fulfilment of the divine promises here on the earth, without attempting to define the nature of the bliss to be enjoyed during the millennium. The second class expected not only to enjoy the indispensable gratifications of the senses, but also marriage pleasures, and every species of sensual indulgence. The third class promised themselves indeed sensitive delights, and these too as rewards for foregoing them now, and as a compensation for the outward sufferings of saints; but they excluded from them the carnal pleasure of sexual intercourse. The fourth was composed of *Nepos* and his followers. The millennial doctrine did not prevail everywhere, and uncontradicted. Yet the believers and the rejecters of the doctrine treated each other with affection, and a per-

thority, in a work written *against the allegorists*, as he contemptuously styled the opposers of the millennium. The book and its arguments were approved by many in the province of Arsinoe, and particularly by *Co-racion*, a presbyter of some respectability and influence. But *Dionysius* of Alexandria, a disciple of *Origen*, allayed the rising storm, by his oral discussions and his two Books *on the divine promises*.(20)

§ 13. As no law had determined in what manner those, who came over from heretical churches to the Catholic Christians, were to be received, different customs prevailed in different churches. Many of the Oriental and African Christians classed reclaimed heretics among the catechumens, and admitted them to the Christian ordinances by baptism. But most of the European Christians regarded the baptism administered by errorists as valid; and therefore received reclaimed heretics, simply with imposition of hands and prayer. This diversity long prevailed, without giving rise to contention. But in this century the Asiatic Christians determined in several councils, what before had been left at discretion, that all heretics coming over to the true church, must be rebaptized.(21) This coming to the knowledge of *Stephen*, bishop of Rome, he with little humanity or prudence, excluded those Asiatics from his fellowship and from that of his church. Notwithstanding this rashness of *Stephen*, *Cyprian* with other Africans, in a council called on the subject, embraced the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice of it to *Stephen*. Upon this, *Stephen* was very indignant; but *Cyprian* replied with energy, and in a new council held at Carthage, again pronounced the baptism administered by heretics to be wholly invalid. The rage of *Stephen* now waxed hotter, and he most unjustly excluded the Africans from the rights of brotherhood. But the discord was healed, partly by the moderation with which the Africans conducted themselves, and partly by the death of *Stephen*.(22)

son might believe or discard it, without bringing his orthodoxy under suspicion. The first open opposer of Chiliasm, that we meet with, was *Caius*, a teacher in the church of Rome, towards the end of the second century. On this ground, he denied that the Apocalypse was written by *John*, and ascribed it rather to *Cerinthus*. But he effected very little. *Origen* was a more powerful opposer of the doctrine. He did not, like *Caius*, deny the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, but explained the passages in it which describe the millennial reign of Christ, allegorically, as referring to spiritual delights, suited to the nature of spirits raised to perfection, and these to be enjoyed, not on the earth, but in the world to come. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 729, &c., and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzererey, vol. ii, p. 136-151.—*Schl.*]

(20) See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles. vii., 24, and *Gennadius* Massiliensis, de Dogmatibus ecclesiasticis, cap. 55, p. 32, ed. Elmenhorst.—[*Nepos* held the Apocalypse to be an inspired book; and he maintained, in opposition to the allegorists, that the passages which speak of a millennial reign of

Christ, must be understood literally, and as promising corporeal and sensitive pleasures. But he does not appear to have defined clearly what these pleasures were to be, though he excluded eating, and drinking, and marriage, as *Dr. Mosheim* supposes, l. c., p. 726. The very obscure and defective history of *Nepos*, and the controversy with him, is explained, as far as it can be, by *Dr. Walch*, l. c., p. 152-167.—*Schl.* See also *W. Muenscher's* Handbuch der Dogmeng., vol. ii., p. 408-434, and *A. Neander's* Kircheng., vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1088-1096.—*Tr.*]

(21) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., vii., c. 5 and 7. *Firmilian*, Epist. ad Cyprianum, inter Epp. Cypriani, 75.—[The councils which decided this point, before *Stephen's* rash procedure, were (1) the council of *Carthage*, about A.D. 215. See Epp. Cypr. 71 and 73—(2) that of *Iconium* in Phrygia, A.D. 235, Epp. Cypr. 75. *Eusebius*, H. E., vii., 4—(3) that of *Synada*, and (4) some others, which are barely mentioned in Epp. Cypr. 75, and *Eusebius*, ubi supra. See *Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml., p. 91, 94, and 96.—*Tr.*]

(22) *Cyprian*, Epp. 70 and 73, and sev-

§ 14. The contests concerning *Origen* were moved by *Demetrius* bishop of Alexandria; who is reported by the friends of *Origen*, to have been influenced by envy and hatred; which however is very doubtful. In the proceedings of *Demetrius* against *Origen*, one may discover marks of a mind exasperated, impassioned, arrogant, and unreasonable, but none scarcely of envy. (23) In the year 228, *Origen* took a journey to Achaia, and on his way suffered himself to be ordained a presbyter by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. At this, *Demetrius* was greatly offended; because he deemed *Origen* unfit for such an office, on account of his having emasculated himself; and because, being master of a school under him, he had been ordained without his knowledge and consent. The matter however was compromised, and *Origen* returned to Alexandria. But not long after, from some unknown cause, new dissension arose between him and *Demetrius*, which became so great, that *Origen* left Alexandria and the school in the year 231, and removed to Cæsarea [in Palestine]. *Demetrius* accused him in his absence, before an assembled council, and deprived him of his office without a hearing; and afterwards, in a second council, divested him of his ministerial character. It is probable that *Demetrius* accused *Origen* before the council, particularly the last one, of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; which it was easy for him to do, as *Origen's* book *de Principiis*, which was full of dangerous sentiments, had been published not long before. The decision of the council at Alexandria was approved by the majority of the Christian bishops, though rejected by those of Achaia, Palestine, Phenicia, and Arabia. (24)

eral others, ed. Baluze. *Augustine*, de Baptismo contra Donatistas, l. vi. and vii., Opp., tom. ix., where he gives the Acts of the council of Carthage, A.D. 256. *Prudent. Maran*, vita Cypriani, p. 107, and all the writers of the life of Cyprian. [The whole history of this controversy is discussed at large by *Dr. Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus, &c., p. 510-547, and still more fully by *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii., p. 328-384.—*Schl.*]

(23) [*Dr. Mosheim* is singular in this opinion; which he defends at great length, in his Comment. de Rebus, &c., p. 671, &c., in opposition to the express testimony of *Eusebius*, H. E., vi., 8, and *Jerome*, Epist. 29, Opp., tom. iv., part ii., p. 68. If *Demetrius* was not envious of the growing reputation of *Origen*, or otherwise affected by personal antipathy, it seems impossible to account for the rancour he manifested.—*Tr.*]

(24) This account is derived from the ori-

ginal sources, especially from *Eusebius*, H. Eccles., vi., 23. *Photius*, Biblioth., cod. cxviii. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., and *Origen* himself. It differs in some respects from that given by the common writers, *Doucin*, *Huet*, and others.—[That *Demetrius* accused *Origen* of erroneous sentiments, is a conjecture of *Dr. Mosheim* and others, which however is expressly denied by *Jerome*, (Ep. 29, ad Paulam, Opp., vol. iv., t. ii., p. 68 and 480, ed. Martianay), Damnatur a Demetrio episcopo; exceptis Palæstinæ et Arabiæ et Phœnicæ atque Achaïæ sacerdotibus, in damnationem ejus (*leg. orbis*) consentit: urbs Roma ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter hæresin, ut nunc rabidi canes simulant, sed quia gloriam eloquentiæ ejus et scientiæ ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes multi putabantur.—Neither is it certain, that *Demetrius* assembled two councils in the case of *Origen*. See *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml., p. 92, &c.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS RITES.

§ 1. Rites multiplied.—§ 2. Public Worship.—§ 3. Administration of the Sacred Supper.—§ 4. Baptism.—§ 5. Various other Rites.

§ 1. ALL the monuments of this century which have come down to us, show that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the causes heretofore mentioned, may be added the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather, the popular superstition of the Oriental nations respecting demons, which was adopted by the Platonists, and received from them by the Christian doctors. For from these opinions concerning the nature and the propensities of evil spirits, many of these rites evidently took their rise. Hence arose the public exorcisms, the multiplication of fasts, and the aversion to matrimony. Hence the caution not to have intercourse with those who were either not yet baptized, or had been excluded from the communion of the church, because such were considered as under the power of some evil spirit. And to pass over other things, hence the painful austerities and penances which were enjoined upon offenders.(1)

§ 2. That the Christians now had in most provinces certain edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, will be denied by no candid and impartial person. Nor would I contend strenuously, against those who think these edifices were frequently adorned with images and other ornaments.(2) As to the forms of public worship, and the times(3) set apart for it, it is unnecessary here to be particular, as little alteration was made in this century. Yet two things deserve notice. *First*, the public discourses to the people underwent a change. For not to mention *Origen*, who was the first so far as we know that made long discourses in public, and in his discourses expounded the sacred volume, there were certain bishops, who being educated in the schools of the rhetoricians, framed their addresses and exhortations according to the rules of Grecian eloquence, and their example met the most ready approbation. *Secondly*; the use of incense was now introduced, at least into many churches. Very learned men have denied this fact; but they do it in the face of testimony which is altogether unexceptionable.(4)

§ 3. To the celebration of the Lord's supper, those who conducted re-

(1) Whoever desires to look farther into this subject, may consult *Porphyry*, on Abstinence from flesh, and various passages in *Eusebius*, *Præparat. Evang.*, and *Theodoret*; and compare them with the Christian institutions.

(2) [Yet there is most ground for the negative.—*Von Ein.*]

(3) [The regular seasons for public worship were all Sundays, Good Friday, Easter, and Whitsunday. See *Origen*, ag. Celsus, b. viii., p. 833. The anniversaries of the local martyrdoms were also observed.—*Von Ein.*]

(4) *Wm. Beveridge*, ad Canon. iii. Apostol., p. 461, and his *Codex Canon. vindicatus*, p. 78. [The Christians originally abhorred the use of incense in public worship, as being a part of the worship of idols. See *Tertullian*, *Apolog.*, c. 42, and *de Corona militis*, c. 10. Yet they permitted its use at funerals, against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship, to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies in hot countries, and at last it degenerated into a superstitious rite.—*Schl.*]

ligious worship annexed longer prayers and more of ceremony; and this, I suppose, with no bad intentions. Neither those doing penance, nor those not yet baptized, were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance; which practice, it is well known, was derived from the pagan mysteries.(5) That golden and silver vessels were used in the ordinance, is testified among others by *Prudentius*;(6) and I see no reason to doubt the fact in respect to the more opulent Christian churches. The time of its administration was different, according to the state and circumstances of the churches. Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening, to be the most suitable time for its celebration.(7) Neither were all agreed, how often this most sacred ordinance should be repeated.(8) But all believed it absolutely necessary to the attainment of salvation; and therefore they universally wished infants to partake of it.(9) In some places the sacred feasts preceded, and in others followed the Lord's supper.(10)

§ 4. *Baptism* was publicly administered twice a year, to such candidates as had gone through a long preparation and trial;(11) and none were present as spectators, but such as had been themselves baptized. The effect of baptism was supposed to be the remission of sins: and it was believed that the bishop, by the imposition of hands and by prayer, conferred those gifts of the Holy Spirit which were necessary for living a holy life.(12) Of the principal ceremonies attending baptism, we have before spoken; [Century II., Part II., Ch. IV., § 13, p. 137]. A few things however must here be added. None were admitted to the sacred font, until the exorcist, by a solemn menacing formula, had declared them free from bondage to the prince of darkness and now servants of God. For when the opinion had become prevalent among Christians, that rational souls originated from God himself, and were therefore in themselves holy, pure, and possessed of free will, either the evil propensities in man must be considered as arising from the body and from matter, or some evil spirit must be supposed to possess the souls of men, and impel them to sin. The

(5) [See *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, Diss. 2 de praejudic. theolog., § 13, p. 149, &c., and *Jos. Bingham*, *Antiquitates Eccles.*, l. x., c. 5.—*Schl.*]

(6) *Περὶ ζεφάν*. Hymn. ii., p. 60, ed. Heinsii, [and *Optatus Milevit.* de schismate Donatist., c. 12, p. 17.—*Schl.*]

(7) [See *Cyprian*, ep. 63, p. 104.—*Schl.*]

(8) [It was commonly administered every Sunday, as well as on other festival days; and in times of persecution, daily. See *Cyprian*, de Oratione Domin., p. 209; ep. 56, p. 90; ep. 54, p. 78; ed. Baluze.—*Schl.*]

(9) [They believed that this ordinance rendered persons immortal; and that such as never partook of it, had no hopes of a resurrection. Hence *Dionysius Alex.*, (cited by *Euseb.*, H. E., vii., 11), calls it ἀσθητήν μετὰ τῆς κυρίου συναγωγῆς. That children also partook of it, is testified by *Cyprian*, de Lapsis, p. 184 and 189, ed. Baluze. See *P. Zorn's Historia Eucharist. infantum*, c. 4, § 1, &c., and c. 6, § 3; also *J. Bingham*,

Antiquitates Eccles., b. xv., ch. 4, § 7.—*Schl.*]

(10) [*Chrysostom*, Homil. 22, oportet haereses esse, Opp., tom. v.—*Schl.*]

(11) [In the Apostolic Constitutions, b. viii., ch. 32, a three years' preparation was enjoined; yet with allowance of some exceptions.—*Schl.*]

(12) This may be placed beyond all controversy by many passages from the fathers of this century. And as it will conduce much to an understanding of the theology of the ancients, which differed in many respects from ours, I will adduce a single passage from *Cyprian*. It is in his Epist. 73, p. 131. Manifestum est autem, ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quæ in baptismo scilicet datur.—Qui vero praepositis ecclesiae offeruntur, per nostram rationem et manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequuntur. See also a passage from *Dionysius Alex.* in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 8.

Gnostics all embraced the first supposition; but the Catholics could in no wise embrace it, because they held that matter was created by God and was not eternal. They had therefore to embrace the second supposition, and to imagine some evil demon, the author of sin and of all evil, to be resident in all vicious persons.(13) The persons baptized returned home, decorated with a crown and a white robe; the first being indicative of their victory over the world and their lusts, the latter of their acquired innocence.(14)

§ 5. To *fasting* greater sanctity and necessity were now attributed, than heretofore; because it was the general belief that demons laid fewer snares for the abstemious and those who fared hard, than for the full fed or such as lived generously.(15) The Latins were singular in keeping every seventh day of the week as a fast;(16) and as the Greek and Oriental Christians would not imitate them in this, it afforded abundant matter for altercation between them.—Ordinarily Christians *prayed* three times a day, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, [9 A.M., 12 Noon, and 3 P.M.] as was the custom of the Jews. Besides these regular hours of prayer, they prayed much and often; for they considered it the highest duty of a religious man to hold converse with God.(17) On joyful and festive occasions, while giving thanks to God, they thought it suitable to pray standing, thus expressing their joy and confidence by the posture of their bodies. But on sorrowful occasions and seasons of fasting and humiliation, they were accustomed to make their supplications on their bended knees or prostrate, to indicate self-abasement.(18) That certain *forms of prayer* were everywhere used, both in public and in private, I have no doubt;(19) but I am likewise confident, that many persons poured out the feelings of their hearts before God in free and unpremeditated effusions. In the *sign of the cross*, they supposed there was great efficacy against all sorts of

(13) That *exorcism* was not annexed to baptism, till some time in the *third* century, and after the admission of the Platonic philosophy into the church, may almost be demonstrated. The ceremonies used at baptism in the *second* century, are described by *Justin Martyr*, in his second apology, and by *Tertullian*, in his book de *Corona militis*. But neither makes any mention of exorcism. This is a cogent argument, to prove that it was admitted by Christians, after the times of these fathers, and of course in the *third* century. Egypt perhaps first received it.

(14) [Perhaps also of their *freedom*.—See *C. G. Schwarz*, Diss. de ceremoniis et formulis a veterum manumissionis ad Baptismum translatis. *Cyprian* refers to the *white garments*; de *Lapsis*, p. 181.—*Schl.*]

(15) *Clementina*, Homil. ix., § 9, p. 688, &c. *Po phyry*, de Abstinencia, lib. iv., p. 417, &c., and others.

(16) [See Concilium Eliberitanum, Canon 26.—*Schl.*]

(17) [See *Cyprian*, de Oratione, p. 214.—*Schl.*]

(18) [See *Cyprian*, de Oratione, p. 214, and Constitut. Apostol., l. ii., c. 59.—*Schl.*]

(19) [In the earliest times, exclusive of the short introductory salutation: Pax vobiscum, &c., no established forms of prayer were used in public worship, but the bishop or presbyter poured forth extempore prayers. See *Justin Martyr*, Apology ii. The Lord's prayer was used, not only as a pattern, but also as a formula of prayer. It et only the baptized, and not the catechumens, might utter it. *Tertullian*, de Oratione, c. 1, 9. *Cyprian*, de Oratione Domin. Constitut. Apostol., l. vii., c. 44. Afterwards various forms were gradually introduced, and particularly short prayers, derived from passages of scripture. When greater uniformity in the churches as to ceremonies was introduced, the smaller churches had to regulate their forms of prayer conformably to those of the larger churches, and of course to adopt the formulas of the metropolitan churches. *Origen*, contra Celsum, l. vi., and Homilia xi. in Jerem. *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini Mag., l. iv., c. 19, 20, 17. Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 17. *Lactantius*, de Morte persecutor., c. 46, 47. See *Baumgarten's* Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthümer, p. 432.—*Schl.*]

evils, and particularly against the machinations of evil spirits; and therefore no one undertook anything of much moment, without first crossing himself.(20)—Other ceremonies I pass without notice.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF DIVISIONS OR HERESIES IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the Ancient Sects.—§ 2. Manes and the Manichaeans.—§ 3. His Principles.—§ 4. His Doctrine concerning Man.—§ 5. Concerning the Nature of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.—§ 6. Concerning the Offices of Christ and the Comforter.—§ 7. Concerning the Purification and Future Condition of Souls.—§ 8. Concerning the State of Souls not Purified.—§ 9. His Opinion of the Old and New Testaments.—10. The Severity of his Moral Principles, and the Classification of his Followers.—§ 11. The Sect of the Hieracites.—§ 12. The Noëtian Controversy.—§ 13. Sabellius.—§ 14. Beryllus.—§ 15. Paul of Samosata.—§ 16. Disturbances in Arabia.—§ 17. Novatian Controversy.—§ 18. Severities of the Novatians towards the Lapsed.

§ 1. Most of the sects which disquieted the church in the preceding centuries, caused it various troubles also in this. For the energies of the Montanists, Valentinians, Marcionites, and other Gnostics, were not wholly subdued by the numerous discussions of their tenets. *Adelphius* and *Aquila* of the Gnostic tribe, but very little known, endeavoured to insinuate themselves and their doctrines into the esteem of the public at Rome and in Italy.(1) But these and others of the same clan, were resisted by *Plotinus* himself, the coryphaeus of the Platonists of this age, and by his disciples, with no less boldness and energy than the orthodox Christians were accustomed to manifest. For the philosophical opinions of this faction, concerning God, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and other subjects, could not possibly meet the approbation of the Platonists. These united forces of the Christians and the philosophers, were doubtless competent to bring the Gnostics, gradually, to lose all credit and influence among the well informed.(2)

(20) [The Christians at first used the sign of the cross, to bring to remembrance the atoning death of *Christ*, on all occasions. Hence *Tertullian*, de Corona militis, c. 3, p. 121, says: ad omnem progressum atque promotum, et omnia aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavaera, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quaecunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. Compare also his work, ad Uxorem, lib. ii. So late as the second century, the Christians attached no particular virtue to the sign of the cross, and they paid it no adoration. See *Tertullian*, Apologet., c. 16, and ad Nationes, c. 12. But afterwards, powerful efficacy began to be ascribed to it. See *Cyprian*, Testimonia adv. Judaeos, l. ii., c. 21, 22, p. 294,

and *Lactantius*, Institut., l. iv., c. 27, 28.—*Schl.*]

(1) *Perphyry*, Vita Plotini, c. 16, p. 118, &c.

(2) The book of *Plotinus* against the Gnostics, is still extant among his works. *Ennead* ii., lib. ix., p. 213, &c. [*Dr. Semler*, in his *Historia Eccles. Selecta Capita*, vol. i., p. 81, conjectures, and not without reason, that the Gnostics, and all the assailants of the Old Testament, lost their power, after *Origen* introduced the allegorical and tropological mode of expounding Scripture, and extended it in some measure to the history of Christ. And as he further supposes, the labours of *Dionysius Alex.* and other learned fathers, e. g. *Dorotheus*, a presbyter of Antioch, (who understood the Hebrew; *Eu-*

§ 2. While the Christians were struggling with these corrupters of the truth, and were on the point of gaining the victory, [a little past the middle of the century], a new enemy, more fierce and dangerous than those, suddenly appeared in the field. *Manes*,⁽³⁾ whom his disciples also called *Manichæus*,⁽⁴⁾ a Persian,⁽⁵⁾ educated among the Magi, and himself one of the Magi before he became a Christian, was instructed in all the sciences and arts that were in repute among the Persians and the adjacent nations, and was an astronomer, (though a rude one), a physician, a painter, and a philosopher; but he had an exuberant imagination, and, as appears very probable, was delirious and fanatical. This man adventured to combine the principles of the Magi with Christianity, or rather to explain the latter by the former. To facilitate the accomplishment of this object, he gave out that *Christ* had left the way of salvation imperfectly explained, and that he himself was the *Paraclete* whom the Saviour promised to send to his disciples when he left the world. Many were seduced by his eloquence, his grave aspect, and the simplicity and innocence of his life; and in a short time he established a sect. But at last, he was put to death by *Varanes I.*, king of the Persians. The cause, time, and manner of his execution are variously stated by the ancients.⁽⁶⁾

sebius, H. E., vii., 32), may have contributed much to diminish the Gnostic party, as they carried investigation farther, and more lucidly confuted the Jewish notions, and at the same time approximated a little towards the Gnostic doctrines concerning the Son of God. Hence it is, we hear no more about the Gnostics in this century; and the few who still remained, united themselves with the Manichæans.—*Schl.*]

(3) [The Oriental writers call him *Mani*; (*Hyde*, de Relig. vet. Persarum, c. 21, and *de Herbelot*, Bibliothèque Orientale, art. *Mani*); but the Greeks and Latins call him *Márvn*, *Máveis*, and *Manes*. See *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 691.—*Schl.*]

(4) [See the *Aeta Archelai*, c. 5, 49. *Augustine*, de Haeresib., c. 46, and contra *Faustum*, lib. xix., c. 22.—*Schl.*]

(5) [Notwithstanding the Greek and Oriental writers represent *Manes* as being a Persian, *Dr. Walch*, (Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 708), and *Beausobre*, (Histoire critique de Manichée, tome i., p. 66), think it more probable that he was a Chaldean; because *Ephraim Syrus* expressly so states, *Opp. Syro-Latin*, tom. ii., p. 468, and because *Archelaus*, in his *Acta cum Manete*, c. 36, charges *Manes* with understanding no language but that of the Chaldees.—*Schl.*]

(6) All that is extant concerning the life, the deeds, and the doctrines of this very singular genius, has been carefully collected, and reviewed ingenuously—though often with more ingenuity and copiousness than were necessary—by *James de Beausobre*, in his *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Ma-*

nicheisme, published at Amsterdam, 1734–39, 2 vols. 4to.—[Whoever would gain the best acquaintance with the history of *Manes* and the *Manichæans*, may consult, besides *Beausobre*, ubi supra, the long essay of *Dr. Mosheim*, in his *Comment. de Rebus*, &c., p. 728–903; *Jo. Christ. Wolf*, *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, &c., Hamb., 1707, 8vo; *Nath. Lardner's* Credibility of the Gospel History, part ii., vol. iii., p. 364–753; and *Dr. C. W. F. Walch's* Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 685–814. These principal writers being consulted, all the rest may be neglected. The last of these works has the great advantage, that it concentrates, arranges properly, criticises acutely and solidly, and expresses in a lucid and agreeable style, all that has been said on the subject by the useful *Wolf*, the agreeable and learned but prolix *Beausobre*, the acute *Mosheim*, and the solid and critical *Lardner*.—*Von Ein.* More recent writers may be consulted, viz., *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., bd. i., abth. ii., s. 813–856, and *K. A. Freih. v. Reichlinn Meldegg*, die Theologie des Magiers *Manes* und ihr Ursprung, Frankfurt a. M., 1825, 8vo.—*Tr.*

The original sources for the history of *Manes* and his sect according to *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus*, &c., p. 729, &c., are, besides the ancient historical writers, *Ephraim Syrus*, *Augustine*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Damascenus*, and *Philastrius*, (1.) what remains of the writings of *Manes* himself and his followers; viz., (a) *Manetis Epistola Fundamenti*, in *Augustine*, contra Ep. Fundamenti; (b) a fragment of his *Sermo de*

§ 3. The religious system of *Manes* is a compound of Christianity and

Fide, in *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxvi., 14; (c) his *Epistola ad Marcellum*, in the *Acta Archelai cum Manete*, p. 6, ed. Zaccag.; (d) some fragments of his *Epistola ad Menoch.* in *Augustine*, adv. Julianum Pelagian.; (e) several extracts from his Epistles, in *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, vol. v., p. 284; (f) *Acta disputationis Archelai, Episc. Mesopot. cum Manete*, inter *Collectanea monumentorum veteris Eccles. Græcæ et Latinæ*, published by *L. A. Zaccagnus*, Rome, 1698, 4to; also, inter *Opp. Hippolyti*, vol. ii., ed. Fabricii. (The genuineness of these *Acta* is questioned by *Beausobre*; but without good reason); (g) many quotations from *Pausanias* the Manichaean, in *Augustine's* thirty-three Books contra Faustum Manichæum; (h) various statements of his antagonists, contained in *Augustine's* two Books, de Actis cum Felice Manichæo; and in his book contra Fortunatum Manichæum.—(II.) the writings of the fathers, who attempted to confute *Manes* and his followers; viz. (a) *Augustine*, de *Haeresibus*, and in the works above mentioned, (I. a, g, and h.).—(b) *Titus* of Bostra, libri iii., contra Manichæos, Gr. and Lat., inter *Lectiones Antiquas*, ed. *Canisii*; et denuo, *J. Basnagii*, tom. i., p. 156, &c.; (c) *Didymus Alexandrinus*, Liber contra Manichæos, Gr. and Lat., in the same *Lectiones Antiq.*, tom. i., p. 197; (d) *Alexander Lycopolitanus*, the philosopher, Liber contra Manichæi opiniones, Gr. and Lat., in the *Auctarium noviss.* *Biblioth. Patr.*, ed. *Combefis*, tom. ii., p. 260.—*Tr.*

In regard to the *history of Manes*, there is much disagreement between the Oriental and Grecian writers. Yet in the particulars stated in the text, there is no disagreement. We will extract from *Mosheim's* Commentaries, p. 734, &c., so much as is necessary to give a full history of this extraordinary man.—*Manes*, on meeting with the books of the Christians, found that the religion they contained, coincided with his philosophy in some respects, and contradicted it in others. He determined to unite the two together, to enlarge and improve the one by the other, and thus to give the world a new religion. He began by giving out that he was the *Paraclete*, (ὁ παράκλητος, John xvi., 7, 13, &c.), and perhaps he really supposed he was so. But he was not so deranged and carried away by his imagination, as to be unable to frame a consistent system, and to discover what would tend to confirm it, and what to weaken it. He therefore rejected or altered such books of the Christians as contravened his opinions, and substituted others in their place, particularly those which he pretended were written by himself under a

divine impulse. The king of Persia threw him into prison; but for what cause is unknown. The Greek writers, (especially *Archelaus*, in his *Acta cum Manete*, who furnished the other Greek and Latin writers with nearly all the historical facts they state), represent that he was imprisoned, because, having promised to cure the king's son, he failed, and caused the death of the young prince. A different account is given by the Oriental writers, (Persian, Syrian, and Arabian, cited by *De Herbelot*, *Bibliothèque Orient.*, art. *Mani*; *Tho. Hyde*, *Historia relig. veter. Persarum*, c. 21. *Euscb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.*, p. 42. *Edw. Pocock*, *Specimen Hist. Arabum*, p. 149, &c.) They state that *Manes*, coming to the court of King *Sapor*, was received kindly; and that his doctrines were embraced by the monarch. Hereupon *Manes* became so bold as publicly to attack the Persian religion. This drew on him persecution, and so endangered his life that he was obliged to flee into Turkistan. Here he collected many followers, and spent a whole year in a cave, where he composed his book entitled *Erteng* or *Arzeng*, i. e., the *Gospel*, and which is adorned with splendid paintings. This book he represented to be a gift of God. In the mean time *Sapor* died, and was succeeded by his son *Hormisdas*; who was so favourable to *Manes*, as to embrace his religion, and to allow him to build a castle in which he might be safe from all plots. Perhaps *Hormisdas* was a favourer of *Manes*, in the lifetime of his father. And *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, (Comment., &c., p. 739), that the Grecian story of his fatal attempt to cure the king's son, was an Oriental allegory, which the Greeks construed literally; that the disease was ignorance, the medicine instruction, the physician the teacher, and the death of the patient his apostacy from the religion of his progenitors: [all of which is very improbable, and indeed inconsistent; for the king, having himself embraced the doctrine of *Manes*, would not have imprisoned him, for converting his son to the same religion.]—After the death of *Hormisdas*, *Veranes* I. succeeded to the throne. He was at first well disposed towards *Manes*, but soon turned against him and determined on his destruction. For this purpose he allured him from his safe retreat, under pretence of a disputation with the Magi, and caused him to be put to death as a perverter of the true religion. This took place in the year 278; or, according to *Dr. Walch*, (*Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. i. p. 724), in the year 277.—The shocking fate of *Manes*, rather animated than terrified his followers.

the ancient philosophy of the Persians, which he had imbibed in early life. What the Persians relate concerning their *Mithras*, Manes applied to *Christ*. According to his views and those of the Persians, there are two first principles of all things, a subtle and very pure substance or *light*, and a gross and corrupt substance or *darkness*. Over each of these a Lord has reigned from all eternity. The Lord of *light*, is denominated *God*; the regent of the *world of darkness*, is called *Hyle* [ὕλη, *matter*], or *dæmon* [the *devil*.] These two lords are of opposite natures and dispositions. The Lord of *light*, as he is himself happy, so he is beneficent; the Lord of *darkness*, being himself miserable, is malignant, and wishes others also to be miserable. Each has produced a numerous progeny of his own peculiar character, and distributed them over his empire.

§ 4. For a long period of time, the Prince of darkness was ignorant of the existence of light, and of the world of light. But on occasion of a war that arose in his kingdom, he gained some knowledge of the light; and on discovering it, he was eager to get possession of it. The Lord of light opposed him with an army; but the general of the celestial army, whose name was *The first Man*, was rather unsuccessful; and the troops of darkness succeeded in getting possession of a considerable portion of the celestial elements, and of *light* itself, which is an animate substance; and these they mixed with depraved matter. The next general on the side of the world of light, called *The living Spirit*, conducted the war more successfully; yet he was unable to liberate the celestial substance that was now in combination with the vicious elements. The vanquished Prince of darkness produced the parents of the human race. The men who are born of this stock, consist of a body formed from the depraved matter of the world of darkness, and of two souls, the one sensitive and concupiscent which they derived from the Prince of darkness, the other rational and immortal, it being a particle of that divine light which was plundered by the army of darkness and immersed in matter.

§ 5. Men being thus formed by the Prince of darkness, and minds, which were the daughters of eternal light, being enclosed in their bodies, God now, by the *living Spirit* who had before vanquished the Prince of darkness, formed this our earth out of vicious matter, that it might become the residence of the human race, and might afford God advantages for gradually delivering souls from their bodies, and separating the good matter from the bad. Afterwards God produced from himself two *majestic beings*, who should afford succour to the souls immured in bodies; namely, *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. *Christ* is the being, whom the Persians call *Mithras*: he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the purest light of God, self-existent, animate, excelling in wisdom, and having his residence in the sun. The *Holy Spirit* likewise is an animate and lucid substance, which is diffused through the whole atmosphere that encompasses our earth, warms and enlightens the souls of men, fecundates the earth, elicits gradually from it the latent particles of divine fire, and wafts them upward, that they may return to their native world.

The most able and eloquent of them roamed through Syria, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and over most parts of the world; and by the severity of their morals and the simplicity of their religion, they everywhere made prose-

lytes. And notwithstanding all the persecutions that have befallen them, their descendants exist to this day, in the mountains between Persia and India.—*Schl.*]

§ 6. After God had, for a long time, admonished the captive souls immured in bodies, by the ministry of angels and by men instructed by himself; he at length, in order to accelerate their return to the heavenly country, directed *Christ* his son to descend from the sun to this our world. He being clad in the form and shadow of a human body, but not joined to a real body, appeared among the Jews, pointed out the way in which souls may extricate themselves from the body, and proved his divinity (7) by his miracles. But the Prince of darkness instigated the Jews to crucify him. This punishment however he did not actually endure, because he had not a body; but the people supposed he was crucified. Having accomplished his embassy, *Christ* returned to the sun, his former residence; and left in charge to his apostles to propagate the religion he had taught them, throughout the world. Moreover, when about to depart, he promised to send, at some time, a greater and more perfect apostle whom he called the *Paraclete*, who should add many things to the precepts he had delivered, and dispel all errors in regard to religious subjects. This *Paraclete* promised by *Christ*, was *Manes* the Persian, who by command of God explained the whole doctrine of salvation, perfectly, and without any ambiguity or concealment.

§ 7. The souls which believe *Jesus Christ* to be the Son of God, cease from worshipping the God of the Jews, (who is no other than the Prince of darkness), obey the laws which were given by *Christ* and enlarged and explained by *Manes* the Paraclete, and perseveringly resist the lusts of the evil soul, these shall gradually become purified from the contaminations of base matter. Yet the entire purgation of the soul cannot be effected in the present life. Therefore souls, when freed from the body, must undergo a twofold purification after death, before they are admitted into the world of light; the first purification is by sacred *water*, and the second by sacred *fire*. They first go to the *moon*, which consists of sacred *water*, and are there purified during fifteen days; thence they proceed to the *sun*, whose holy *fire* entirely removes all their remaining pollution. The bodies which they left behind, being formed of base matter, revert back to their original mass.

§ 8. But the souls which have neglected the means for their purgation, will, after death, pass into other bodies, either of animals or of other beings, until they become cleansed. Some also being peculiarly depraved, will be delivered over to the evil demons inhabiting our atmosphere, to be tormented for a season. When the greater part of the souls shall be liberated and be restored to the world of light, then, at the command of God, infernal fire will burst from the caverns in which it is contained, and will burn up and destroy the fabric of this world. After these events, the Prince and powers of darkness will be compelled to retire to their wretched country, where they must remain for ever. For to prevent their again waging war against the world of light, God will encompass the world of darkness with an invincible guard. That is to say, the souls whose sal-

(7) [Not his Divinity: for this, in the true and proper sense of the word, the Manichæans could not predicate of *Christ*, nor of the *Holy Ghost*. They held neither of them to be more ancient than the world. See *Fortunatus*, in his dispute with *Augustine* I,

p. 69. They believed that the *light* of the *Son* might be obscured by intervening matter, but that the *light* of the *Father* could not. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus, &c., p. 775, &c.—*Schl.*]

vation has become desperate, will keep watch like soldiers about the world of darkness, so that its miserable inhabitants can no more go out.

§ 9. To give some plausibility to these monstrous opinions, *Manes* rejected nearly all the sacred books, in which the Christians believed their religion was contained. The *Old Testament* especially, he pronounced to be the work, not of God, but of the Prince of darkness, whom he represented the Jews as worshipping in place of the true God. The four histories of *Christ* which we call *Gospels*, he either denied to have been composed by the apostles, or he maintained that if they were so, they had been corrupted, interpolated, and stuffed with Jewish fables by crafty and deceitful men. In place of them he substituted another Gospel, which he denominated *Erteng*, and which he affirmed had been dictated to him by God himself. The *Acts of the Apostles* he wholly rejected. The *Epistles* which are ascribed to *St. Paul*, he admitted to have been written by him, but maintained that they were adulterated. What he thought of the other books of the New Testament, we are not informed.

§ 10. The rules of life which *Manes* prescribed for his followers, were peculiarly rigorous and severe. For he directed them to mortify and macerate the body, which he regarded as the very essence of evil, and the work of the Prince of darkness; to deprive it of every convenience and gratification, to extirpate every sensual appetite, and to divest themselves of all the propensities and instincts of nature. But as he foresaw that he could expect few to embrace his system, if he imposed upon all without discrimination such severe rules of life, he divided his followers into two classes, the *elect* and the *hearers*, that is, the *perfect* Christians and the *imperfect*. (8) The former, or the *elect*, were to abstain from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, and every inebriating drink, from marriage, and from every indulgence of sexual passions, to live in the most abject poverty, to sustain their emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse and melons, to abstain from all active life, and to be devoid both of love and hatred. A milder rule was prescribed for the *hearers*. They might possess houses, lands, and goods, eat flesh, though sparingly, and marry wives: yet even these indulgences had their limitations. The whole body of Manichaeans were subjected to one president, who represented *Jesus Christ*; with him were connected twelve *masters*, or rulers, who represented the twelve apostles; next to these, there were seventy-two *bishops*, corresponding with the seventy-two disciples of Christ; and under each bishop, there were *presbyters* and *deacons*. All these officers were from the class of the *elect*. (9)

(8) [The *elect* were also called the *faithful*, or *believers*; and the *hearers* were called *catechumens*. The former were either *baptized*, or *unbaptized*. If baptized, they could not change their condition; if unbaptized, they might return to the class of *hearers*, if they found themselves unable to endure the rigorous discipline of the perfect. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 896, &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) All these particulars are more fully stated, and supported by citations from antiquity, in my Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., [pa. 728–903—with which, the reader should compare *Dr. Walch's Historie*

der Ketzereyen, vol. i., p. 685–814. From both, we extract the following notices, respecting the *worship* of this sect. They revered the sun and the moon, though they did not account them deities. Their worship was so simple, that they claimed to be farther removed from paganism, than all other Christians. They had no temples, no altars, no images, no oblations, and no burning of incense. They observed Sundays, which they kept as fasts. But they observed none of the Christian festivals, which relate to the incarnation and baptism of *Christ*. They celebrated the memorial of *Christ's* death, but with little of devotion. Whether they

§ 11. The sect of the *Hieracites* was formed in Egypt, near the close of this century, by *Hierax* of Leontopolis, who was a bookmaker by trade, a man of learning and venerable for the visible sanctity of his deportment. Many have supposed that this sect was a branch of the Manichaean family, but erroneously; for though *Hierax* held some notions in common with *Manes*, yet he differed from him in many respects. He believed it was the great business of *Christ* to promulge a *new law*, more perfect and more strict than that of *Moses*. And hence he concluded that *Christ* had prohibited to his followers, marriage, flesh, wine, and whatever was grateful to the senses or the body: which things had been allowed of by *Moses*, but were abrogated by *Christ*. Yet if we duly consider all accounts, we shall conclude that *Hierax*, as well as *Manes*, did not suppose these severe injunctions were imposed by *Christ* on *all* his followers, but only on those who aspired after the highest attainments in virtue. To this radical error, he added others either growing out of it, or originating from other sources. For example, he excluded infants, who died before they came to the use of reason, from the kingdom of heaven; because divine rewards could be due to none but such as had actually passed through regular conflicts with the body and its lusts. He also maintained, that *Melchisedek*, the king of Salem who blessed Abraham, was the *Holy Spirit*. The resurrection of the body, he denied; and the whole sacred volume, especially its historical parts, he obscured with allegorical interpretations.(10)

§ 12. The controversies respecting the divine *Trinity*, which commenced in the preceding century, from the time when Grecian philosophy got into the church, had a wider spread in this century, and produced various methods of explaining that doctrine. First, [in the early part of the century], *Noëtus*, a man of whom little is known, a native of Smyrna, maintained that *God* himself, whom he denominated the *Father*, and held to be absolutely *one and indivisible*; united himself with the man *Christ*, whom he called the *Son*; and, in him, was born and suffered. From this dogma of *Noëtus*, his adherents were called *Patripassians*; i. e., persons who held that the great *Parent* of the universe himself, and not merely some *one person* of the Godhead, had made expiation for the sins of men. Nor were they unfitly denominated so, if the ancients correctly understood their views.(11)

observed Easter, is uncertain. But they observed the anniversary of *Manes'* death, which they called *Bama*, (*βῆμα*), with great devotion. *Fasting* was one of their most important religious exercises. They kept sacred Sundays and Mondays. They made use of *baptism*; but did not baptize either children, or grown persons who were only *hearers*; and even to the *elect*, it was left optional, whether they would be baptized or not. The *elect* observed likewise the *Lord's Supper*; though it is not known what they used in place of wine, which was with them altogether prohibited.—*Schl.*]

(10) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres* lxvii. [and *Augustine*, de *Haeresib.*, c. 47], from whom nearly all others have borrowed, with little

exception, all they state. [See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 903-910. *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. i., p. 815-823. *Tillemont*, *Mem. pour servir à l'Hist. Eccles.*, tom. iv., p. 411, and *Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel Hist.*, pt. ii., vol. vi., p. 76, &c.—*Schl.* Also *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, b. i., abth. iii., s. 1218-1223.—*Tr.*]

(11) See *Hippolytus*, *Sermo contra Haeresin Noëti*, in his *Opp.*, tom. ii., p. 5, ed. *Fabricii*; *Epiphanius*, *Haeres* lviii., *Opp.*, tom. i., p. 479; *Theodoret*, *haeret. Fabul.*, l. iii., c. 3, *Opp.*, tom. iv., p. 227.—[*Noëtus* so held the *unity* of *God*, as to discard the orthodox opinion of a plurality of persons in the Godhead. In fact he acknowledged

§ 13. After the middle of the century appeared *Sabellius*, an African presbyter or bishop, at Ptolemais, the principal city in Pentapolis, a province of Libya Cyrenaica. He explained what the scriptures teach concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in a manner somewhat different from *Noëtus*; and notwithstanding he was confuted by *Dionysius* of Alexandria, he gathered a number of followers. *Noëtus* had supposed that God the Father, *personally*, assumed the human nature of Christ; but *Sabellius* held that only a certain *energy*, put forth by the supreme Parent, or a certain *portion* of the divine nature, being separated from it, became united with the *Son* or the man *Christ*. And the *Holy Spirit* he considered as being a similar portion or part of the eternal Father. (12) Hence it appears,

but *one person*; who is designated in the Scriptures by the title of the *Father*. *Noëtus* therefore was a *Unitarian*, as respects the doctrine of *three persons*; but in regard to the character of *Christ*, he held better views than the *Socinians*. So far as relates to two natures united in one person, in Christ, he agreed with the orthodox; but the divine person, which was united with the human nature, according to *Noëtus*' views, was no other than the person of the *Father*, because there was no other person in the Godhead. See *Mosheim*, de Rebus Christianor., p. 681-687; and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. ii., p. 1-13.—*Schl.*]

(12) Most of the ancients who wrote against the heretics, speak of *Sabellius*; [especially *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxii., and *Theodoret*, haer. Fabul., l. ii., c. 9.—*Tr.*] To these, add *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl., l. vi., c. 6. *Athanasius*, de sententia Dionysii; [and *Basil* the Great, Ep. 210 and 235.—*Tr.*] Nearly all that is written by the ancients, has been collected by *Christopher Wormius*, in his Historia Sabelliana, Francf. and Lips., 1696, 8vo, a learned work, only a small part of which relates to *Sabellius*.—[See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 688-699. (*J. Beausobre*, Histoire de Maniché, &c., tome i., p. 533, &c. *N. Lardner*, Credibility of the Gosp. Hist., pt. ii., vol. , p. 553, &c.), and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. ii., p. 14-49.—The last of these differs some from *Dr. Mosheim*, in his description of the Sabellian doctrine. We would place the two accounts side by side, without attempting to decide so difficult a question.—The most common opinion respecting the Sabellian doctrine, was this: *Sabellius* admitted but *one person* in the divine essence; or he denied that the Father was one person, the Son another person, and the Holy Spirit a third; of course he discarded the inherent distinction of three persons. He admitted a difference only of *names*, and of some external *relations* to creatures, in regard to the government of the world and of the church: and he ascribed

to the Son, those works which we regard as the personal acts of the Father; and on the other hand, he ascribed to the Father, the acts and the sufferings of the Son. Now *Dr. Mosheim* concedes, that *Sabellius* taught there was but *one divine person*; but he maintains also, that Sabellius admitted a *Trinity*, and a real *difference* between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; though this *difference* was neither an essential, nor a personal one; the divine *three* were not three distinct *persons*, but three *portions* of the divine nature, all depending on God, and at the same time differing from God, and from each other. That portion, by which God made the world, is the *Father*; and is also the father of *Christ*, inasmuch as it formed him in the womb of *Mary*. That portion, which united itself with the man *Christ*, in order to redeem men, is the *Son*; inasmuch as it dwelt in the *Son of God*, (a designation, which refers to his miraculous conception), and by him gave instruction, wrought miracles, and, in a sense, made one person with him. The third portion of the divine nature, which imparts life to all living beings, enlightens men, regenerates them, and prompts them to what is good, is the *Holy Ghost*. These three are, in one view, separate from God; but in another, they are united with him.—After a critical examination of the correctness of this scheme, *Dr. Walch* cannot fully accord with the views of chancellor *Mosheim*. He therefore states the doctrine of *Sabellius* thus: the ancients, one and all, say that the Sabellian system marred the true doctrine concerning God, and concerning all the three persons. And so it appears to be proved, by the ancients, that Sabellianism was one of two directly opposite errors, of which Arianism was the other; and that the true doctrine occupied the middle ground between them: indeed *Arius*, by pushing his opposition to *Sabellius* too far, was led into his error. It hence follows, that *Sabellius*, who did not deny the existence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, made too little distinction between

that the *Sabellians* must have been denominated *Patripassians* by the ancients, in a different sense of the word from that in which the *Noëtians* were so called. Yet the appellation was not wholly improper.

§ 14. Nearly at the same time, [about A.D. 244], *Beryllus*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, a pious and learned man, taught that *Christ*, before his birth of the Virgin, had no distinct divinity, but only had the divinity of the *Father*. This proposition, if we duly consider what is reported concerning him by the ancients, contained the following sentiment; that *Christ* had no existence before he was born of Mary; that at his birth, a *soul* originating from God himself, and of course superior to all human souls, being a particle of the divine nature, entered into and was united with the

them; while *Arius* made the distinction too wide. It is clear, that *Sabellius* acknowledged but *one person*, and considered the Son of God as not being a *distinct* person: so that he could not have taught a *personal* distinction in the Trinity. By the Word (*λόγος*), *Sabellius* understood an *energy*, by which the man *Christ* performed his works. So long as *Christ* remained on earth, this divine energy was in him; but afterwards it ceased. It was therefore like a sunbeam, which operates on bodies and produces the effects of the sun, without being itself a person. So also is it with the *Holy Ghost*, by which we are to understand the *operations* of God in men, tending to further their knowledge of the truth and their advancement in virtue. The manner of God's *putting forth his energy*, by which the Son was produced, and by which the Holy Ghost is still produced and continued, the ancients expressed by the words, to *spread out*, or *extend* (*πλάτνυσθαι*, *protere, extendere*), to *send forth* (*πέμπεσθαι*), and to *transform*, or *change one's form and appearance* (*μεταμορφοῦσθαι*, *μετασχηματίζειν*). From what has now been stated, it may be perceived, how *Sabellius* could have taught the existence of three *forms* or *aspects* (*τρία πρόσωπα*) in the divine essence, without admitting the reality of three different *persons*; and how his opposers could infer, that he admitted but *one distinction* under three different *names*. The greatest difficulty is in this, that according to some representations, *Sabellius* taught there was a *difference* or *separation* (*διαίρεσιν*) between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but according to other accounts, he maintained such a *unity*, as was inconsistent with it. This difficulty is the most easily surmounted, by supposing the former to refer to an imagined or conceived distinction, and not any real one.—Such are *Dr. Walch's* views of the Sabellian system; [and very similar are those of *Dr. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1018–1025.—*Tr.*] *Dr. Walch* thinks, that *Sabellius* ought not to be

called a *Patripassian*: for these held *Christ* to be *one person*, in whom *two natures* were personally united; and believed that, not the divine nature of the *Son*, as a person, but the divine nature of the *Father* who was the only person, was united with the human nature in *Christ*. Now as *Sabellius* held the Son to be no real *part* of the Father, and held still less to a *personal* union of two natures in *Christ*; he cannot truly be called a *Patripassian*. According to *Sabellius's* opinion, *Christ* was a *mere man*, in whom resided a *divine power*, that produced those effects which we regard as the acts of the divine nature united to the human.—Among the opposers of *Sabellius*, *Dionysius* of Alexandria attracted the most notice. Yet the opposition made by this bishop, was not satisfactory to all. Offensive passages were found in his epistles against the Sabellians. As he there brought forward the doctrine of *Christ's incarnation*, and from that deduced his proof of the real distinction between the Father and the Son; he was understood as holding, that the Son, in so far as he was a divine being, was a *created* one, or as denying, that the Father and the Son were of the same essence. *Dionysius* defended himself, and showed that he had been misunderstood. Notwithstanding this, the *Arians*, after his death, claimed him as on their side; which obliged *Athanasius* to vindicate the reputation of *Dionysius* against them. Still there continued to be some, to whom this defence appeared insufficient; *Basil* the Great is an example. There can be no doubt that *Dionysius* thought with *Athanasius*, in regard to the *Trinity*, but he used the *language* of *Arius*. In regard to the *person* of *Christ*, he expressed himself in the manner of *Nestorius*; for he carried the distinction between the divine and the human natures of *Christ*, so far, as wholly to exclude the former from a participation in those changes in the latter which were the result of the personal union of the two natures. See *Dr. Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzeren*, vol. ü., p. 50–63.—*Schl.*]

man. *Beryllus* was so lucidly and energetically confuted by *Origen*, in a council assembled at Bostra, [A.D. 244], that he gave up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church. (13)

§ 15. Very different from him both in morals and in sentiment was *Paul* of Samosata, a bishop of Antioch [in Syria], and at the same time clothed with the civil office of a *ducenarius*. (14) He was an ostentatious man, opulent and arrogant; (15) and he greatly disquieted the eastern church, soon after the middle of this century, by his novel explanations of the doctrine concerning the divine nature and concerning *Christ*. The sect which embraced his opinions, were called *Paulians* or *Paulianists*. So far as can be judged from the accounts that have reached us, he supposed the Son and the Holy Spirit to exist in God, just as reason and active power do in a man; that *Christ* was born a mere man, but that the *wisdom* or *reason* (λόγος) of the Father descended into him, and enabled him to teach and to work miracles; that on account of this union of the divine Word (λόγος) with the man *Christ*, we might say *Christ* was *God*, though not in the proper sense of the word. He so concealed his real sentiments under ambiguous forms of speech, that repeated ecclesiastical councils were wholly unable to convict him; but at last, in the council assem-

(13) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. vi., c. 20 and 33. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 60. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 7. Among the moderns, see *Jo. le Clerc*, Ars Critica, vol. i., pt. ii., sec. i., c. 14. *Chaufepied*, Nouveau Dictionnaire histoire crit., tome i., p. 268, &c. [See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 699, &c., and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. ii., p. 126-136.—*Dr. Walch* indeed does not place *Beryllus* among the *heretics*, because he is not chargeable with obstinacy in his errors, nor with establishing a sect or party; both of which are necessary to constitute a heretic. Concerning his sentiments, little is known, except that he maintained that *Christ*, before his incarnation, did not exist as a divine person; but that after his incarnation, he was a man in whom *God*, namely the *Father*, dwelt.—*Dr. Mosheim's* assertion, that *Beryllus* represented *Christ* as possessing a *soul* derived from the divine essence, is a mere conjecture that can not be supported by proof.—*Schl.* *Dr. Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. i., pt. iii., p. 1014, &c., places *Beryllus* among that class of *Patripassians*, who considered the personality of the Son of God as originating from a *radiation* or *emanation*, from the essence of God, into a human body. He therefore places *Beryllus* and *Sabellius* in the same class.—*Tr.*]

(14) [The *ducenarii* were a species of *procurators* for the emperor in the provinces, whose salary was *two hundred* sesteritia, [*duцена* sesteritia, equal to \$7193.60], from which sum, these officers derived their title. See *Dion Cassius*, lib. 53. *Suetonius*,

Claudian, c. 24, and *Salmasius*, Notes on *Capitolinus*, Pertinax, p. 125. From *Seller's* Antiquities of Palmyra, Lond., 1696, 8vo, p. 166, &c., it appears, that this office was much used in the province of Syria: and *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, (Comment. de Rebus, &c., p. 705), that *Paul* obtained it by means of *Zenobia*, who had a high esteem of him.—*Schl.*]

(15) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 30. [*Eusebius* here gives copious extracts from the circular letter of the council, which condemned *Paul* and ordained *Domnus*, his successor. The council characterize *Paul*, as having risen from poverty to opulence by extortion and bribery; as proud, and insolent, and ostentatious; as choosing to be addressed by his civil title, and appearing in public attended by guards and all the splendour of worldly rank; as affecting splendour and power, and abusing authority as an officer in the church; as intolerably vain, and coveting the adulations of the multitude; as decrying the fathers of the church, exalting himself, and abolishing the hymns in common use, and appointing women to sing psalms in praise of himself; as sending out bishops and presbyters to sound his praise, and to extol him as an angel from heaven; as keeping several young and handsome women near his person, whom he enriched with presents, and as living in luxury with them.—How much of colouring there may be in this picture, we have not the means of determining. But there can be little doubt, that the character of *Paul* was such as did not become a bishop.—*Tr.*]

bled A.D. 269, *Malchion*, a rhetorician, drew him from his concealment; and he was convicted and divested of his episcopal office.(16)

§ 16. In a very different way some little philosophers in Arabia, the disciples of a man unknown, marred a part of the Christian system. They denied the soul to be *immortal*; maintaining that it died with the body, and that it would be resuscitated with it by the power of God.(17) The believers in this doctrine were called *Arabians*, from the country in which they lived. *Origen* being sent from Egypt, disputed against them with such success in a full council, that they renounced their error.

§ 17. Among the sects which arose in this century, that of the *Novatians* is placed last. They did not indeed corrupt the doctrines of Christianity; but by the severity of the discipline to which they adhered, they produced a lamentable schism. *Novatian*,(18) a presbyter in the church of Rome, a man of learning and eloquence, but of a stern and austere character, maintained, that such as had fallen into the more heinous sins, and especially such as had denied *Christ* during the Decian persecution, ought never to be admitted again to the church. Most of the other presbyters, as well as *Cornelius*, whose influence was very great, were of a different opinion. Hence, in the year 250, when a new bishop was to be chosen

(16) See *Epistolam Concilii Antiocheni ad Paulum*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. xi., p. 302, ed. Paris, 1644, fol., and *Dionysii Alexandrini Ep. ad Paulum*, *ibid.*, p. 273, and *Decem Pauli Samosatani Quæstiones*, *ibid.*, p. 278.—[See also *Dr. Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.*, &c., p. 701-718, and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 64-125. From the last writer, we extract the following, to give a more full and correct view of the Samosatene doctrines. 1. *Paul* of Samosata taught, that there is but one God, who in the Scriptures is denominated the *Father*. 2. He did not deny, that the Scriptures speak of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 3. What he understood by the *Holy Ghost*, we do not know; and *Dr. Mosheim* has attempted to supply this defect, by a mere conjecture. 4. Concerning the *Word* and the *Wisdom* of God, he has spoken largely: but whether he distinguished between the *Word in God*, (λόγος ἐνδιώδεντος), and the *Word produced from God*, (λόγος προφορικός), is doubtful. 5. This *Word* or *Wisdom* in God, is not a substance or a person. 6. But it is in the divine mind, as reason is in men. 7. *Christ* was a mere man. 8. He first began to exist, when he was born of Mary. 9. Yet in this man, dwelt the divine *Word* or *Wisdom*; and it was operative in him. 10. The union commenced, when *Christ* was conceived in the womb of Mary. 11. By means of this *Wisdom* of God in him, *Christ* gradually acquired his knowledge and his practical virtues. By it, he became at once *God* and the *Son of God*; yet both, in an

improper sense of the terms. 12. This divine wisdom withdrew from him when he suffered.—From this account it appears, that *Photian*, in the next age, came very near to *Paul* of Samosata, not indeed in his statements and expressions, but rather in his grand error, namely, that *Christ* was a mere man, and superior to other men only on account of his pre-eminent gifts.—*Schl.* See also *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, bd. i., abth. iii., p. 1007-1014.—*Tr.*]

(17) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vi., c. 37. [See *Mosheim*, *Comment. de Rebus Christianor.*, &c., p. 718, and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 167-171.—As *Eusebius*, who is the only witness we have in regard to this sect, gives a very brief account of them, the learned in modern times have entertained two opinions concerning their system. Some suppose they held that the soul, though immaterial, sleeps while the body is in the grave: which however, the words of *Eusebius* seem to contradict, for they describe the soul as *dying*, and *being dissolved with the body*, συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι. Others suppose more correctly, that they were Christian materialists, who regarded the soul as being a part of the body. And *Dr. Mosheim* conjectures, that their error originated from their combining the Epicurean philosophy with Christianity.—*Schl.*]

(18) [The Greeks always write his name *Noratus* or *Naratus*; but the Latins generally write it *Noratianus*, perhaps to distinguish him from *Novatus* of Carthage, the names being really the same.—*Tr.*]

at Rome in place of *Fabian*, *Novatian* strenuously opposed the election of *Cornelius*. Yet *Cornelius* was chosen, and *Novatian* withdrew from communion with him. On the other hand, *Cornelius*, in a council held at Rome A.D. 251, excommunicated *Novatian* and his adherents. *Novatian* therefore founded a new sect, in which he was the first bishop. This sect had many adherents who were pleased with the severity of its discipline; and it continued to flourish in many parts of Christendom, until the *fifth* century. The principal coadjutor of *Novatian* in this schism, was *Novatus*, a presbyter of Carthage, who fled to Rome during the heat of this controversy, in order to escape the wrath and the condemnation of *Cyprian* his bishop, with whom he was in a violent quarrel. (19)

(19) [Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 220, &c., after surveying the original accounts, gives the following connected view of these events. A great number of those who in the Decian persecution had fallen from their steadfastness, having afterwards repented of their fall, and sought to be admitted again to the communion of the church, gave rise to the question of conscience, how they ought to be treated. The episcopal chair at Rome was at that time vacant, in consequence of the death of *Fabian*; and the clergy were divided in regard to this question, some advocating mild, and others more rigorous measures. Among the latter was *Novatian*, among the former *Cornelius*, both of them elders in the church of Rome. On the side of *Novatian* were several confessors; that is, persons who had endured various corporeal punishments during the persecution, without denying the faith; and these were haughty and overbearing towards their fallen brethren. While this subject was in agitation at Rome, news came from Carthage, that the lapsed there would be received again, but only after enduring a long penance; though, if in imminent danger of death, and they desired it, they might be restored without delay. And these principles were approved at Rome, in an epistle composed by *Novatian*, (inter *Epistolæ Cypr.*, ep. 31). Now came on the election of a bishop of Rome; and here the two parties were divided. *Novatian* solemnly declared, that he did not desire the office; and *Cornelius* was chosen by a majority of the votes. But as *Cornelius* was one of the milder party, not only *Novatian* but also the confessors and several of the elders, were dissatisfied with his election; and, it would seem, separated themselves from him. About this time *Novatus* arrived from Carthage. He had fallen out with *Cyprian*, his bishop; and perhaps knew, that *Cyprian* was a friend of *Cornelius*; but the former did not commit himself. *Cornelius* acquainted *Cyprian* with his election. Information had already reached Carthage, that

Cornelius was not approved by all at Rome; and *Cyprian* did not venture at once to declare in his favour, but sent two African bishops, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, to Rome, with a letter addressed not to *Cornelius* as bishop, but to the clergy there, and to the neighbouring bishops who were present at the election. The Cornelian party again stated, that his election was regular; and the African envoys, with two envoys from Rome who accompanied them home, affirmed the same thing. Hereupon *Cornelius* was recognised at Carthage, as being the bishop of Rome. But at Rome the business was not so easily settled. The dissatisfied party urged on a new election; and *Novatus* and *Evaristus* were the most suitable persons to persuade *Novatian* to consent to receive ordination. As at least three bishops must impose hands on a bishop-elect, three such clergymen were drawn from some small towns in Italy, and by deception induced to perform this act. The ordination was also performed at an unusual hour. *Novatian* appears to have reluctantly consented to it; but he afterwards endeavoured to support himself in office. He sent letters everywhere, and twice despatched envoys to Africa. These could get no hearing from *Cyprian* and his adherents; yet their mission was not without effect. In other countries likewise, he found persons, who considered his dissatisfaction with *Cornelius* and with his conduct towards the lapsed, as being well founded. In the mean time *Cornelius* held a council at Rome, which approved of the milder principles of discipline. *Novatian* was present, and resisted those principles before the council; but he was excommunicated by it, together with his adherents. This caused his party to diminish, many of his friends choosing rather to be on the strongest side: and hence he may have been induced, when administering the sacrament of the supper to his followers, to make them promise not to forsake him.—*Schl.* As the dissensions at Carthage about the same time, had some connexion with those at Rome,

§ 18. Respecting the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, there was no disagreement between the *Novatians* and other Christians. Their peculiarity was, that they would not receive into the church persons, who after being baptized fell into the greater sins. They did not however exclude them from all hopes of eternal salvation. They considered the Christian church, therefore, as a society of innocent persons, who from their entrance into it had defiled themselves with no sin of any considerable magnitude; and hence it followed, that all associations of Christians, which opened the door for the return of gross offenders, were in their view unworthy of the name of true churches of Christ. And hence they assumed the appellation of *Cathari*, that is, the *pure*; and what was still more, they rebaptized such as came over to them from the Catholics. For such influence had the error they embraced upon their own minds, that they believed the baptism of those churches which readmitted the lapsed, could not impart to the subjects of it remission of sins. (20)

and also tend to show the state of the church in the middle of this century; the following account of them is extracted from *Mosheim's* Comment. de Rebus, &c., § xiii., p. 497, &c., and § xiv., p. 503, &c. *Novatus*, a presbyter at Carthage, even before the Decian persecution, had disagreed with *Cyprian* his bishop, and formed a party who were dissatisfied with him, and who would not yield to all his wishes. According to the representations of his adversaries, *Novatus* was not only arrogant, factious, vain, and rash, but chargeable with many offences and crimes. *Cyprian* therefore resolved to bring him to a trial, and to excommunicate him. The day for trial was appointed; but the imperial edict [for the persecution] unexpectedly intervened; and as *Cyprian* was obliged to retire into concealment, *Novatus* continued safe in his office. This was the first act in the long tragedy. While *Cyprian* was in retirement, and the African magistrates fiercely persecuting the Christians, these contests were suspended. But when the violence of the storm from without was past, and *Cyprian* was preparing to return to his church, *Novatus* fearing, no doubt, that the bishop would renew the prosecution against him, which was commenced before his retirement, deemed it necessary to raise a party against the bishop, which should prevent his returning to his church, and thus deprive him of the power of doing him harm. By means of *Felicissimus*, therefore, whom he had made his deacon, contrary to the will of the bishop, *Novatus* alienated a part of the church from *Cyprian*. *Felicissimus*, aided by one *Augendus*, prevented the exe-

cution of the plans of the bishop in regard to the poor. Many of the people came over to his party; and also five presbyters, who had long been at variance with *Cyprian*. This turbulent party were able to retard a little, but not to prevent the return of *Cyprian*. After some delay, which prudence dictated, the bishop returned to Carthage; and having assembled a council on the subject especially of the lapsed, he punished the temerity of his adversaries, and excommunicated *Felicissimus*, the author of the revolt, together with the five presbyters his associates. *Novatus* was not of the number, as he was absent, having fled to Rome as soon as he found *Cyprian* would come to Carthage. The excommunicated persons, despising the censure passed on them, instituted a new church at Carthage, in opposition to that of *Cyprian*, and established as the bishop of it, *Fortunatus*, one of the presbyters whom *Cyprian* had condemned. But the party had more resolution than ability, and the schism was probably extinguished not long after its birth; for no mention is made of its progress by any of the fathers.—*Tr.*]

(20) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 43. *Cyprian*, in various of his Epistles, as Ep. 49, 52, &c. *Gabr. Albaspinarux*, Observat. Eccles., lib. ii., c. 20, 21. *Jos. Aug. Orsi*, de criminum capital. inter veteres Christ. Absolutione, p. 254, &c. *Steph. Kenckel*, de hæresi Novatiana, Argentor., 1651. 4to; [also, *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., &c., p. 512-537, and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii., p. 185-288.—*Schl.* And *A. Neander*, Kirchengesch., bd. i., abth. i., s. 387-407.—*Tr.*]

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK II.

EMBRACING
EVENTS FROM CONSTANTINE THE GREAT
TO CHARLEMAGNE.

CENTURY FOURTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH: EXHIBITING BOTH THE PROSPEROUS AND THE ADVERSE EVENTS OF IT.

§ 1. Peaceful State of Christians at the beginning of the Century.—§ 2. Persecution of Diocletian.—§ 3. The Causes and the Severity of it.—§ 4. The Christian Cause reduced to great Extremities.—§ 5. Tranquillity restored on the Accession of Constantine to Supreme Power.—§ 6. Defeat of Maxentius.—§ 7, 8. Different Opinions concerning the Faith of Constantine.—§ 9. The Cross seen by him in the Heavens.—§ 10. Persecution of Licinius.—§ 11. State of the Church under the Sons of Constantine the Great.—§ 12. Julian persecutes the Christians.—§ 13. His Character.—§ 14. The Jews attempt to rebuild their Temple in vain.—§ 15. State of the Church after the Death of Julian.—§ 16. Remains of the Pagans.—§ 17. Efforts of the Philosophers against Christianity.—§ 18. Injuries it received from them.—§ 19. Propagation of Christianity among the Armenians.—§ 20. The Abyssinians and Georgians.—§ 21. The Goths.—§ 22. The Gauls.—§ 23. The Causes of so many Revolutions.—§ 24. Slight Persecutions in Persia.

§ 1. THAT I might not separate too much those facts which are intimately connected with each other, I have determined here to exhibit the prosperous and the adverse events, not as heretofore in distinct chapters, but combined in one series, following as much as possible the order of time.—In the beginning of this century, the Roman empire had four sovereigns; of whom two were superior to the others, and bore the title of *Augustus*, namely, [*Valerius*] *Diocletian*, and [*Marcus Aurelius Valerius*] *Maximianus Hercules*: the two inferior sovereigns, who bore the title of *Cæsars*, were *Constantius Chlorus*, and *Galerius Maximianus* [*Armentarius*]. Under these four [associated] emperors, the state of the church was peaceful and happy. (1) *Diocletian*, though superstitious, indulged no hatred towards the Christians. (2) *Constantius Chlorus*, following only the dictates of reason in matters of religion, was averse from the popular idolatry, and friendly to the Christians. (3) The pagan priests therefore, from well-

(1) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., c. 1. [*Eusebius* here describes the prosperous state of the Christians, and their consequent security and vices. The imperial palaces were full of Christians, and no one hindered them from openly professing Christianity. From among them, men were chosen to the offices of imperial counsellors, provincial governors, magistrates and generals. The bishops and other clergy were held in honour, even by those who adhered to the old religion of the state. And the number of Christians was seen to be increasing daily. Hence in all the cities, spacious buildings were erected for public worship, in which the people as-

sembled without fear: and they had nothing to wish for, unless it were that one or more of the emperors might embrace their religion.—*Schl.*]

(2) [He had Christians in his court, who understood how to lead him, and who would probably have brought him to renounce idolatry, had not the suggestions of their enemies prevailed with him. His wife *Prisca* was, in reality, a concealed Christian; and also his daughter *Valeria*, the wife of *Galerius Maximianus*. See *Lactantius*, de Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 15.—*Schl.*]

(3) [Some go still farther, and make him to have been actually a Christian. But from

grounded fears lest Christianity to their great and lasting injury should spread far and wide its triumphs, endeavoured to excite *Diocletian*, whom they knew to be both timid and credulous, by means of feigned oracles and other impositions to engage in persecuting the Christians.(4)

§ 2. These artifices not succeeding very well, they made use of the other emperor, *Galerius Maximianus*, who was son-in-law to *Diocletian*, in order to effect their purpose. This emperor, who was of a ferocious character and ill-informed in everything except the military art, continued to work upon his father-in-law, being urged on partly by his own inclination, partly by the instigation of his mother, a most superstitious woman, and partly by that of the pagan priests, till at last, when *Diocletian* was at Nicomedia in the year 303, he obtained from him an edict, by which the temples of the Christians were to be demolished, their sacred books committed to the flames, and themselves deprived of all their civil rights and honours.(5) This *first* edict spared the lives of the Christians; for *Diocletian* was averse from slaughter and bloodshed. Yet it caused many Christians to be put to death, particularly those who refused to deliver up their sacred books to the magis-

the representations of *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. viii., c. 13, no more can be inferred than that he was disposed to look favourably upon the Christian religion.—*Schl.*]

(4) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, lib. ii., c. 50. *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar., lib. iv., c. 27, and de Mortibus Persequutor., c. 10. [According to *Eusebius*, l. c., it was reported to the emperor, that the oracle of *Apollo* had declared, that he was prevented from giving true responses by the *righteous men on the earth*; and this the pagan priests interpreted when questioned by the emperor, with reference to the *Christians*. According to *Lactantius*, ubi supra, while *Diocletian* was at Antioch, in the year 302, the priests who inspected the entrails of the consecrated victims, declared that they were interrupted in their prognostications by the sign of the cross made by several of the emperor's servants.—*Schl.*]

(5) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 11. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 2. [This persecution should, properly, be named that of *Galerius Maximianus*, and not that of *Diocletian*. For *Diocletian* had much the least hand in it, and he resigned his authority before the persecution had continued quite two years; moreover *Maximianus*, in his edict for putting an end to the persecution, a little before his death, acknowledges that he himself was the author of it. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., viii., 17, and *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 34. *Romulia*, the mother of *Galerius*, who was a very superstitious and haughty woman, and who was offended that the Christians would not allow her to be present when they celebrated the Lord's supper, contributed to inflame the rage of her son against them. Perhaps also

the Platonic philosophers had some influence in exciting the emperor's hostility; for they represented the many sects among the Christians in a most odious light, and taxed them with having apostatized from the religion of the early Christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., viii., c. 17. But political considerations may likewise have influenced him. *Galerius* contemplated getting rid of his colleagues, and making himself sole emperor. The Christians, who were attached to *Constantius Chlorus* and his son, seemed to him to stand in the way of his designs; and he wished to weaken their power, or rather to annihilate it as far as practicable. But *Diocletian* was not disposed to further his cruel project. He was willing to exclude Christians from the palace and the army, and to compel all who served him at court or in the armies, to offer sacrifices to the gods; but not to suspend over them penal laws and executions. *Galerius* would have them all brought to the stake. A council was called, composed of learned civilians and officers in the army, which declared against the Christians. To this decision, *Hierocles*, the governor of Bithynia, the man who afterwards wrote against the Christians, contributed not a little. But *Diocletian* would not yet give up entirely. He would consult the oracle of *Apollo* at Miletus; which likewise directed to the extirpation of the Christians. But even *Apollo* could not move the superstitious emperor to the extreme of cruelty. He decreed indeed a persecution; but it was to cost no blood. It commenced with the demolition of the Christian temple at Nicomedia, and the burning of the books found in it. See *Mosheim*, Com. de Reb., &c., p. 916-922.—*Schl.*]

trates.(6) Seeing this operation of the law, many Christians, and several even of the bishops and clergy, in order to save their lives, voluntarily surrendered the sacred books in their possession. But they were regarded by their more resolute brethren as guilty of sacrilege, and were branded with the name of *Traditors*.(7)

§ 3. Not long after the publication of this first edict, there were two conflagrations in the palace of Nicomedia; and the enemies of the Christians persuaded *Diocletian* to believe, that Christian hands had kindled them. He therefore ordered many Christians of Nicomedia to be put to the torture, and to undergo the penalties due to incendiaries.(8) Nearly at the same time, there were insurrections in Armenia and in Syria; and as their enemies charged the blame of these also upon the Christians, the emperor by a *new* edict ordered all bishops and ministers of Christ to be thrown into prison; and by a *third* edict, soon after, he ordered that all these prisoners should be compelled by tortures and punishments to offer sacrifice to the gods:(9) for he hoped, if the bishops and teachers were once brought to submission, the Christian churches would follow their example. A great multitude therefore, of excellent men, in every part of the Roman empire, Gaul only excepted, which was subject to *Constantius Chlorus*,(10) were either punished capitally, or condemned to the mines.

§ 4. In the second year of the persecution, A.D. 304, *Diocletian* published a *fourth* edict, at the instigation of his son-in-law and the other enemies of the Christians. By this edict the magistrates were directed, to compel all Christians to offer sacrifices to the gods, and to use tortures for that purpose.(11) And as the governors yielded strict obedience to

(6) *Augustine*, Breviculum collat. cum Donatistis, c. 15, 17, in his Opp., tom. ix., p. 387, 390, and *Baluze*, Miscellan., tom. ii., p. 77, 92.

(7) *Optatus Milerit*, de Schismate Donatist., l. i., § 13, p. 13, ed. *Du Pin*.

(8) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 6. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 14. *Constantine* the Gr. Oratio ad Sanctorum coetum, c. 25.—[After the second conflagration, *Galerius* left Nicomedia, pretending to be afraid of being burned up by the Christians. *Diocletian* also compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice to the gods, in proof that they were not Christians; and caused many Christians of his household and court to be cut off, and *Lonthimus* the bishop of Nicomedia, with many of the clergy and common Christians, to undergo cruel deaths, because they refused to offer sacrifices to the gods.—*Schl.*]

(9) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 6, and de Martyribus Palaestinae, [Introduction.]—[Some degree of probability could be attached to the charge against the Christians of causing the insurrections, from the fact that their inconsiderate zeal sometimes led them to deeds which had an aspect of rebellion. At the commencement of this persecution, for example, a very respectable Christian tore down the imperial edict against

the Christians, which was set up in a public place. See *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 5 —*Schl.*]

(10) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutorum, c. 15. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 13, 18.—[*Constantius Chlorus* presided over Spain and Britain, as well as Gaul. In Spain there were some martyrs, because *Constantius* not being present there in person, he could not prevent the rigorous execution of the decree of the senior emperor. But in Gaul, where he was personally present, he favoured the Christians as much as sound policy would permit. He suffered some of the churches to be demolished, and most of them to be shut up. And when the last edict of *Galerius* against the Christians was promulgated, he enjoined upon all his Christian servants, to relinquish either their mode of worship or their offices; and when they had made their election, he deprived all those of their offices who resolved to adhere to Christian worship, and retained the others in his service.—*Schl.*]

(11) *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 3.—[*Diocletian* was not yet willing the Christians should be put to death outright; his orders to the governors were couched in general terms, that they should compel the Christians, by all kinds of corporeal sufferings, to give honour to the heathen gods.

these orders, the Christian church was reduced to the last extremity.(12) *Galerius Maximianus* therefore no longer hesitated to disclose the secret designs he had long entertained. [A.D. 305.] He required his father-in-law, [*Diocletian*], together with his colleague, [*Valerius*] *Maximianus Herculeus*, to divest themselves of their power, and constituted himself emperor of the East; leaving the West to *Constantius Chlorus*, whose health he knew to be very infirm. He also associated with him in the government, two assistants, of his own choosing; namely, [*C. Galerius*] *Maximinus*, his sister's son, and [*Flavius*] *Severus*; excluding altogether *Constantine*, afterwards styled the Great, the son of *Constantius Chlorus*.(13) This revolution in the Roman government restored peace to Christians in the western provinces, which were under *Constantius*:(14) but in the eastern provinces, the persecution raged with greater severity than before.(15)

See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. ii., c. 51; compare *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar., l. v., c. 11. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. ix., c. 9, and l. viii., c. 12. Hence, according with the disposition of the several governors, was their execution of the imperial edict. Some only sent the Christians into banishment, when the attempt to make them offer sacrifices failed. Others deprived them of an eye, or lamed one of their feet by burning it; or others exposed them to wild beasts; or lacerated their bodies with iron hooks or with the scourge; and afterwards sprinkled vinegar and salt on the wounds, or dropped melted lead into them. In Phrygia, a whole city with all its inhabitants was burned to ashes, because not an individual in it would offer sacrifice. *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar., lib. v., c. 11. Some Christians also brought death upon themselves, by holding religious meetings contrary to the emperor's prohibition, or by voluntarily presenting themselves before the governors and requesting to be martyred. *Sulpitius Severus*, Hist. Sacra, lib. ii., c. 32, and *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 3.—*Schl.*

(12) *Lactantius*, Instit. Divinar., lib. v., c. 11.—[With the exception of Gaul, streams of Christian blood flowed in all the provinces of the Roman empire. Everywhere the Christian temples lay in ruins, and all assemblies for worship were suspended. The major part had forsaken the provinces, and taken refuge among the barbarians. Such as were unable or unwilling to do this, kept themselves concealed, and were afraid for their lives if they appeared in public. The ministers of Christ were either slain, or mutilated and sent to the mines, or banished the country. The avaricious magistrates and judges had seized upon nearly all their church property and their private possessions. Many, through dread of undergoing torture, had made away with their own lives, and many had apostatized from the faith; and what remained of the Christian community,

consisted of weak, poor, and timorous persons.—*Schl.*]

(13) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 18, 20.—[*Galerius Maximianus* was in more fear of the young prince *Constantine*, than of his father *Constantius*; the latter being a mild and sickly sovereign, while *Constantine* was of an ardent temperament, and at the same time greatly beloved by the people and the soldiers. Yet *Galerius* had this prince in his power; for he detained him at his court in Nicomedia, and if he found occasion, might have put him out of his way by assassination or some other means. Indeed *Galerius* attempted this, especially in the year 306. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 24. But *Constantine* saved himself by flight, and repaired to his father in Britain. This sagacity of the prince overset the whole plan of the emperor, and was the means of rescuing the Christian religion from its jeopardy. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb., &c., p. 942, &c.—*Schl.*]

(14) *Eusebius*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 13.—[*Eusebius* says expressly that Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Spain, Mauritania and Africa, enjoyed peace, after the two first years of the persecution. Nor was this strange; for *Constantius Chlorus*, who governed Britain, Spain, and Gaul, was a friend to the Christians; and *Severus*, who in the character of a Cæsar, held the other western provinces, was obliged to show deference to *Constantius* as the emperor of the West. Neither was the debauched *Severus*, of himself, inclined to cruelty. Yet the Christians enjoyed less freedom under him, than under *Constantius*. See *Optatus Milevitanus*, de Schismate Donatist., l. i., c. 14, comp. c. 16.—*Schl.*]

(15) *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 21.—[*Lactantius* here states, that *Galerius Maximianus* gave orders, that such Christians as could not by tortures be induced to sacrifice, should be roasted over a

§ 5. But divine providence frustrated the whole plan of *Galerius Maximianus*. For *Constantius Chlorus* dying in Britain the year 306, the soldiery by acclamation made his son *Constantine*, who afterwards by his achievements obtained the title of *the Great*, Augustus or emperor: and the tyrant *Galerius* was obliged to submit, and even to approve this adverse event. Soon after, a civil war broke out. For, *Maxentius* [the son of the ex-emperor, *Valerius Maximianus Herculus*, and] the son-in-law of *Galerius Maximianus*, being indignant that *Galerius* should prefer *Severus* before him, and invest him with imperial power, himself assumed the purple; and took his father, *Valer. Maxim. Herculus* for his colleague in the empire. In the midst of these commotions, *Constantine*, beyond all expectation, made his way to the imperial throne. The western Christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted, enjoyed a good degree of tranquillity and liberty, during these civil wars.(16) But the Oriental churches experienced various fortune, adverse, or tolerable, according to the political changes from year to year.(17) At length *Galerius Maximianus*, who had been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought low by a terrific and protracted disease, and finding himself ready to die, in the year 311 issued a decree which restored peace to them, after they had endured almost unbounded sufferings.(18)

slow fire. *Maximin*, who governed Syria and Egypt, at first showed himself quite mild towards the Christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. ix., c. 9. But afterwards, he seemed to wish to surpass all other enemies of the Christians, in cruelty towards them. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb., &c., p. 945, &c.—*Schl.*]

(16) [*Constantine*, as soon as he came into power, gave the Christians full liberty to profess and to practise their religion. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persecutor., c. 24, and Institut. Divinar., l. i., c. 1. This he did, not from a sense of justice or from magnanimity, and still less from any attachment to the Christian religion, but from principles of worldly prudence. He wished to attach the Christians to his party, that they might protect him against the power and the machinations of *Galerius Maximian*. His brother-in-law, *Maxentius*, imitated his example, and with similar views; and therefore the Christians under him in Africa and Italy, enjoyed entire religious liberty. See *Optatus Milevitanus*, de Schismate Donatist., l. i., c. 16, and *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 14. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. Christianor., p. 952, &c.—*Schl.*]

(17) [In the eastern provinces, which were under the government of *Galerius Maximianus* and *C. Galerius Maximinus*, Christians were the most cruelly persecuted; as is manifest from various passages in *Eusebius*. Yet *C. G. Maximin* did not at all times treat them with equal severity. According to *Euseb.*, (de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 9), in the year 308, the persecution seem-

ed to be at an end in Syria and Palestine: but it soon after recommenced, with increased severity. The cause of these vicissitudes is to be sought in the political state of things. In this year, *C. G. Maximin* assumed the title of *Cæsar* in Syria, against the will of *Galerius Maximianus*; and the latter appeared about to declare war against the former; who therefore was indulgent towards the Christians, in order to secure their friendship. But as *Galerius Maximianus* was appeased, *C. G. Maximin* became more severe against the Christians, in order to ingratiate himself more effectually with the emperor. After a while, however, he abated his severity; and towards the end of the year 309 and in the beginning of 310, the Christians enjoyed great freedom: (*Euseb.*, de Martyr. Palaestinae, c. 13), for *Galerius Maximianus* was now in declining health, and in such circumstances, *C. G. Maximin* wished not to alienate the Christians from himself. Yet when the governor of the province informed him, in the year 310, that the Christians abused their freedom, *Maximin* renewed the persecution. But soon after *Galerius Maximianus* was seized with his last and fatal sickness, and *C. G. Maximin* being apprehensive that the imperial power could be secured only by a successful appeal to arms, policy required him again to desist from persecuting the Christians. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 16. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Reb. Christianor., p. 955, &c.—*Schl.*]

(18) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 16. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persecutor.,

§ 6. After the death of *Galerius Maximianus*, [A.D. 311], *C. Galerius Maximinus* and *C. Val. Licinius*, [who was created Augustus by *Galerius Maximianus*, after the death of *Flavius Severus*, A.D. 307], divided between themselves the provinces which had been governed by *Galerius*. At the same time *Maxentius*, who held Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon *Constantine* who governed in Spain and Gaul; in order to bring all the West under his authority. *Constantine*, anticipating his designs, marched his army into Italy in the year 312, and in a battle fought at the Milvian bridge near Rome, routed the army of *Maxentius*. In the flight, the bridge broke down, and *Maxentius* fell into the Tiber, and was drowned. After this victory, *Constantine* with his colleague *C. Val. Licinius*, immediately gave full liberty to the Christians of living according to their own institutions and laws; and this liberty was more clearly defined the following year, A.D. 313, in a new edict drawn up at Milan. (19) *C. Gal. Maximin* indeed, who reigned in the East, was projecting new calamities for the Christians, (20) and menacing the emperors of the West with war; but being vanquished by *Licinius*, he put an end to his own life by swallowing poison, at Tarsus, in the year 313.

c. 33.—[The decree is given us, in Greek, by *Euseb.*, Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 17, and in Latin, by *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 34.—*Schl.*]

(19) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. x., c. 5. *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 48. [It is the second edict, or that of Milan, which is found in the passages here referred to: *Eusebius* gives it in Greek, *Lactantius* in Latin. The first edict is wholly lost; yet from the second, we may learn what was obscure or indefinite in the first. The first edict gave religious freedom, not only to the Christians, but to all other sects; yet it forbid any person's abandoning the religion in which he had been born and brought up. This prohibition operated disadvantageously to the Christian cause; and occasioned many, who had recently embraced Christianity, to return to their former religion, in obedience to the imperial edict. This prohibition therefore, with all other restraints, was removed in the second edict. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 959.—*Schl.*]

(20) [*C. Gal. Maximin* did not at first venture to contravene the edict of *Gal. Maximianus*, (giving full toleration to the Christians), yet he did not publish it in his provinces; but afterwards, by underhanded evasions he violated it. For if we may believe *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 36), he slyly so managed, that what some cities petitioned for, namely, that the Christians might be prevented from erecting temples within their walls, was effected. *Eusebius* relates, (Hist. Eccles., l. ix., c. 2), that through the medium of one *Theotecnus*, he induced the Antiochians to petition to him, that no Christian might be allowed to reside

in their city; and then granted them their petition. Other cities followed this example, and thus a new persecution was set on foot. Perhaps *Lactantius* and *Eusebius* erred, in representing *Maximin* as the original cause of these applications to himself. Such petitions were in fact presented; and as the emperor was about engaging in war with *Constantine*, he used every means to secure the fidelity of cities in the East to himself; and as the persecution of the Christians was one of the means to be used, therefore he gratified their wishes. Subsequently, when the first edict of *Constantine* and *Licinius* was brought to him, in the year 312, he would not suffer it to be published in his provinces; probably from pride, he deeming it unsuitable, for him to be the publisher of edicts given out by persons whom he regarded as his inferiors in rank. Yet, according to *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccles., l. ix., c. 9), he sent a letter to his governors of provinces, which was very favourable to the Christians, and in which he requested his subjects to treat them kindly and tenderly. The Christians however, put no confidence in this letter, and were still afraid openly to profess their religion. But after he had been vanquished by *Licinius*, in the year 313, he published a new edict in favour of the Christians; (*Euseb.*, Hist. Eccles., l. ix., c. 10), in which he laments that the judges and magistrates had misinterpreted the former law; and he now expressly gives the Christians liberty to rebuild their temples, and commands that the property taken from them should be restored. Soon after this, he died; and the ten years' persecution ended. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 961, &c.—*Schl.*]

§ 7. About this time *Constantine* the Great, who was previously a man of no religion, is said to have embraced Christianity, being induced thereto, principally, by the miracle of a cross appearing to him in the heavens. But this story is liable to much doubt. For his first edict in favour of the Christians, and many other things, sufficiently evince indeed that he was at that time well disposed towards the Christians and their worship, but by no means that he regarded Christianity as the only true and saving religion; on the contrary, it appears that he regarded other religions, and among them the old Roman religion, as likewise true and useful to mankind; and he therefore wished all religions to be freely practised throughout the Roman empire.(21) But as he advanced in life, *Constantine* made progress in religious knowledge, and gradually came to regard Christianity as the only true and saving religion, and to consider all others as false and impious. Having learned this, he now began to exhort his subjects to embrace Christianity; and at length he proclaimed war against the ancient superstitions. At what time this change in the views of the emperor took place, and he began to look upon all religions but the Christian as false, cannot be determined. This however is certain, that the change in his views was first made manifest by his laws and edicts, in the year 324, after the death of *Licinius*, when *Constantine* became sole emperor.(22) His purpose however, of abolishing the ancient religion of the Romans and of tolerating only the Christian religion, he did not disclose till a little before his death, when he published his edicts for pulling down the pagan temples and abolishing the sacrifices.(23)

21) [This is evident from *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. i., c. 27. In the commencement of the war with *Maxentius*, he was still at a loss to what God he should trust himself and his affairs. He at length determined to honour that one God only, whom his father had worshipped, and to show no reverence to the ancient Roman deities. The grounds on which he came to this decision, were feeble; namely, the good fortune of his father who adhered to this worship; and the ill fortune and lamentable end of *Diocletian*, *Galerius Maximian*, and other emperors, who had worshipped the pagan deities. And according to *Eusebius* (de Vita Constantini, l. i., c. 28), he knew so little of the God of his father, that he prayed he might be able to know him. He was a *deist* of the lowest class, who considered the God of his father as a limited being, though more benevolent and powerful than any of the Greek and Roman deities. This is manifest from his regulations in favour of the Christians, and from his laws tolerating the pagan *haruspices*. Codex Theodos., l. ix., tit. 16, leg. 1, 2, and l. xvi., tit. 10, leg. i. Compare *Zosimus*, lib. ii., p. 10, ed. Oxford, 1679, 8vo. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 371, &c.—*Schl.*]

(22) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. ii., c. 20 and 44. [In this year, 324, all those

who for their adherence to Christianity during the preceding persecution had become exiles, or been sent to the mines, or been robbed of their property, were restored to their country, their liberty, and their possessions; and the Christian temples were ordered to be rebuilt and enlarged.—*Schl.*]

(23) See *Ja. Gothofred*, ad Codicem Theodos., tom. vi., pt. i., p. 290, &c. [The statement of *Zosimus* (lib. ii., p. 104) is not to be wholly rejected. He says that after the death of *Licinius*, a certain Egyptian came to Rome from Spain, and convinced the emperor of the truth of the Christian religion. No reason can be assigned, why *Zosimus* should have fabricated such a story. This Egyptian was probably *Hosius*, the bishop of Corduba; who was a native Egyptian, and was then at the court of *Constantine* very probably soliciting the restoration of the church goods which had been confiscated. At least, it is expressly stated that the money destined for Africa, was paid in consequence of his efforts. This conjecture is favoured by *Baumgarten*, Auszug der Kirchengesch., vol. ii., p. 691. The later Greeks ascribe the emperor's conversion to a courtier named *Euphrates*; of whom however, the ancients make no mention. *Theodoret*, (Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 17), ascribes it to the influence of *Helena* his mother; but she was brought to em-

§ 8. That the emperor was sincere and not a dissembler in regard to his conversion to Christianity, no person can doubt, who believes that men's actions are an index of their real feelings. It is indeed true, that *Constantine's* life was not such as the precepts of Christianity required;(24) and it is also true that he remained a *catechumen* all his life, and was received to full membership in the church by baptism at Nicomedia only a few days before his death.(25) But neither of these is adequate proof, that the emperor had not a general conviction of the truth of the Christian religion, or that he only feigned himself a Christian. For in that age many persons deferred baptism till near the close of life, that they might pass into the other world altogether pure and undefiled with sin;(26) and it is but too notorious, that many persons who look upon the Christian religion as indubitably true and of divine origin, yet do not conform their lives to all its holy precepts.—It is another question, whether worldly motives might not have contributed in some degree, to induce Constantine to prefer the Christian religion to the ancient Roman, and to all other religions, and to recommend the observance of it to his subjects. Indeed it is no improbable

brace Christianity by her son, according to *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. iii., c. 47.—*Zosimus* relates that *Constantine* asked the pagan priests to absolve him from the guilt of destroying *Licinius*, *Fausta*, and *Crispus*; and when they told him this was impossible, the Egyptian before mentioned, undertook to show that the Christian religion offered the means of cleansing away his guilt; and this it was, induced the emperor to embrace Christianity. There is perhaps some degree of truth in this story; perhaps *Constantine* did, in fact, after the death of *Licinius* first learn, either from this Egyptian or from some others, that the blood of *Christ* was expiatory for believers therein. It is at least certain, that in the first years after his victory over *Maxentius*, he had very incorrect ideas of *Christ* and of the Christian religion; as is manifest from his Rescript to Anulmus, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. x., c. 7. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 976, &c.—*Schl.*]

(24) [He put to death his own son *Crispus*, and his wife *Fausta*, on a groundless suspicion; and cut off his brother-in-law *Licinius*, and his unoffending son, contrary to his plighted word; and was much addicted to pride and voluptuousness.—*Schl.*]

(25) *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, lib. iv., c. 61, 62.—Those who, in reliance on more recent and dubious authorities, maintain that *Constantine* received Christian baptism at Rome, in the year 324, and from the hands of *Sylvester*, then the bishop of Rome, do not at this day gain the assent of intelligent men, even in the Roman Catholic church. See *Henry Noris*, Historia Donatist., in his Opp., tom. iv., p. 650. *Tho. Maria Mamachius*, Origines et Antiqq.

Christianae. tom. ii., p. 232, &c. [*Valesius*, in his notes on *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. iv., c. 61, where *Eusebius* relates, that *Constantine* first received imposition of hands, previous to his baptism, a little before his death; infers, that the emperor then first became a *catechumen*, because he then first received imposition of hands. But the bishops laid hands on the catechumens, at various times, and for various purposes: and the connexion here shows, that *Eusebius* refers to that imposition of hands, which immediately preceded, and was connected with baptism. See *Tertullian*, de Baptismo, c. 20. It will not follow, therefore, that *Constantine* had never before received imposition of hands, for other purposes. But suppose he had not, still we do not know that the only mode of constituting a catechumen, in that age, was by imposition of hands: and if it was, so great an emperor might be excused from the ceremony, which could plead no divine authority. That *Constantine* long before this time, declared himself a *Christian*, and was acknowledged as such by the churches, is certain. It is also true that he had for a long time performed the religious acts of an unbaptized Christian, that is, of a *catechumen*; for he attended public worship, fasted, prayed, observed the Christian Sabbath and the anniversaries of the martyrs, and watched on the vigils of Easter, &c., &c. Now these facts show that he had, in fact, long been a catechumen; and that he did not first become so, at the time hands were laid on him in order to his baptism. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 965, &c.—*Tr.*]

(26) [See *Ant. Fred. Busching's* Disput. de Procrastinatione Baptismi apud veteres, ejusque Causis.—*Schl.*]

conjecture, that the emperor had discernment to see that Christianity possessed great efficacy, and idolatry none at all, to strengthen public authority and to bind citizens to their duty. (27)

§ 9. The sign of the cross, which *Constantine* most solemnly affirmed he saw in the heavens in broad daylight, is a subject involved in the greatest obscurities and difficulties. It is however an easy thing to refute those who regard this prodigy as a cunning fiction of the emperor, or who rank it among fables: (28) and also those who refer the phenomenon to natural causes, ingeniously conjecturing that the form of a cross appeared in a solar halo, or in the moon: (29) and likewise those who ascribe the transac-

(27) See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. i., c. 27. [The Romans had then lost nearly all their former virtue, fidelity, good sense and valour; and in their place, tyranny, profligacy, and shameful vices and crimes succeeded and became prevalent, especially, during the persecution of the Christians. Among the more intelligent, very little of the ancient superstitious spirit remained; so effectually had the Christian and pagan philosophers exposed the turpitude of the old religion. But among the Christians, who were spread far and wide in the Roman empire, and here and there had brought over some of the neighbouring nations to their religion, great firmness and stability of mind was manifest, together with good faith and honesty. Hence *Constantine* the Great might readily see, that the Christian religion would contribute much more to the tranquillity of the empire, and to the establishment of his dominion, than the old religion could do.—*Schl.*]

(28) *Joh. Hornbeck*, Comment. ad Bulam Urbani viii., de Imaginum cultu, p. 182, &c. *Ja. Oiselius*, Thesaurus Numismat. antiquor., p. 463. *Ja. Tollius*, Preface to his French translation of *Longinus*; and in his notes on *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 44. *Christ. Thomasius*, Observat. Hallens., tom. i., p. 380; and others. [There is difference of opinion as to the time when, and the place where the emperor saw this cross. Some follow *Eusebius*, (de Vita Constantini, l. i., c. 28), and believe that he saw it while in Gaul, and when making preparations for the war with *Maxentius*. Others rely on the testimony of *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 44), and believe that he saw the cross on the 26th day of October, A.D. 312, [the day before the battle, in which *Maxentius* was vanquished near Rome.] So thought *Stephen Baluze*; (see his notes on this passage in *Lactantius*); whom *Pagi*, *Fabrius*, and others have followed. The point is a difficult one to decide; and the brothers *Ballerini*, (Observ. ad *Norisii* Hist. Donatist., Opp., tom. iv., p. 662), would compromise

it, by supposing there were two appearances of the cross, both in dreams, the first in Gaul and the last in Italy: which is a miserable shift.—Among those who regard the whole story as a fabrication, some suppose it was a pious fraud, and others that it was a trick of state. The first supposition is most improbable. For at the time the cross is said to have appeared to him, *Constantine* thought nothing about spreading the Christian religion, but only about vanquishing *Maxentius*. Besides he was not then a Christian, and did not use the event for the advancement of Christianity, but for the animation of his troops. The other supposition has more probability; indeed, *Licinius* once resorted to something like this, according to *Lactantius*, de Mortib. Persequutor., c. 46.—But *Constantine* solemnly averred the reality of this prodigy; and if he had been inclined to use artifice in order to enkindle courage in his soldiers, he would far more probably, as his army was made up chiefly of barbarians and such as were not Christians, (see *Zosimus*, l. ii., p. 86), have represented *Mars* or some other of the vulgar deities as appearing to him. See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christianor., p. 978, &c.—*Schl.*]

(29) See *Joh. Andr. Schmidt*, Diss. de Luna in Cruce visa, Jena, 1681, 4to, and *Joh. Albert. Fabricius*, Diss. de Cruce a Constantino visa, in his Biblioth. Gr., vol. vi., cap. i., p. 8, &c.—[This opinion also has its difficulties. *Fabricius* himself admits, that on his hypothesis the appearance of visible words in the air cannot be explained. And he resorts to a new exposition of the language of *Eusebius* for relief, and believes that the words by this conqueror, (ἐν τέρῳ νικᾷ, hoc vince), were not actually seen, but that the sense of them was emblematically depicted, in a crown of victory that appeared in the heavens. But (1) if the emperor intended to say this, he expressed himself very obscurely. (2) It is certain, that *Constantine* did not intend to be so understood; for he caused the very words mentioned to be affixed to the standards (Labara)

tion to the power of God, who intended by a miracle to confirm the wavering faith of the emperor.(30) And these suppositions being rejected,

of the legions, and to the medals and other monuments of the event; which he would not have done, had he not designed it should be understood that these words were actually seen in the heavens. (3) All the ancient writers so understood the account given by *Eusebius*. (4) Such a halo about the sun, as that described by the emperor, has never been seen by man. For he did not see the sign or form of a real cross, but the Greek letter X, intersected perpendicularly by the letter P; thus, ✠. [*Euseb.*, de Vita Constant., l. i., c. 31.] See *Mosheim*, Comment. de Rebus Christ., p. 985.—*Schl.*]

(30) [*Eusebius* alone, (de Vita Constantini, l. i., c. 28–31), among the writers of that age, gives us any account of the vision of the cross; though *Lactantius*, (de Mortib. Persecutor., c. 44), and others speak of the “dream,” in which *Constantine* was directed to use the sign of the cross. *Eusebius*’ account is as follows: “He conceived that he ought to worship only the God of his father. He therefore called upon this God in prayer, entreating and beseeching him, to manifest to him, who he was, and to extend his right arm on the present occasion. While he was thus praying with earnest entreaty, a most singular divine manifestation (θεοσημία τις παραδοξοτάτη) appeared: which, perhaps, had another declared it, would not easily be credited; but the victorious emperor himself having related it to us who write this, when we had a long time afterwards the privilege of knowing and conversing with him, and having confirmed it with an oath; who can hesitate to believe the account! and especially, as the subsequent time [or the events which followed] affords evidence of its truth? He said that, about the middle hours of the day, as the sun began to verge towards its setting, he saw in the heavens, with his own eyes, the sun surmounted with the trophy of the cross, (ὕπερκειμενον τῷ ἡλίῳ σταυρὸς τροπαιοῦν), which was composed of light, and had a legend (γραφὴν) annexed, saying, *by this conquer*. And amazement seized him, and the whole army, at the sight, (ἐπὶ τῷ θεάματι), and the beholders wondered as they accompanied him in the march. And he said, he was at a loss what to make of this spectre, (τί ποτε εἶναι τὸ φῶσμα), and as he pondered and reflected upon it long, night came upon him by surprise. After this, as he slept, (ὕπνῳ ἑνὶ ἑαυτῷ), the *Christ* of God appeared to him, together with the sign before seen in the heavens, and bid him make a representation of the sign that appeared in the heavens, and

to use that as a protection (τάτῳ ἀλεξήματι χρῆσθαι) against the onsets of his enemies. As soon as it was day, he arose, related the wonder (τὸ ἀπόρρητον) to his friends; and then assembling the workers in gold and precious stones, he seated himself in the midst of them, and describing the appearance of the sign, (τὰ σημεῖα), he bid them imitate it in gold and precious stones. This we were once so fortunate as to set our eyes upon.” *Eusebius* then goes into a long description of this sacred standard, which was called the *Labarum*. Its shaft was a very long spear, overlaid with gold. On its top, was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the sacred symbol, namely, the Greek letter X, intersected with the letter P. Just under this crown, was a likeness of the emperor, in gold; and below that, a crosspiece of wood, from which hung a square flag, of purple cloth embroidered and covered with precious stones.—Now if this narrative is all true, and if two connected miracles were actually wrought, as here stated; how happens it that no writer of that age, except *Eusebius*, says one word about the luminous cross in the heavens?—How came it, that *Eusebius* himself said nothing about it in his *Eccles. History*, which was written twelve years after the event, and about the same length of time before his *Life of Constantine*? Why does he rely solely on the testimony of the emperor, and not even intimate that he ever heard of it from others; whereas, if true, many thousands must have been eyewitnesses of the fact?—What mean his suggestions, that some may question the truth of the story; and his caution not to state anything as a matter of public notoriety, but to confine himself simply to the emperor’s private representation to himself?—Again, if the miracle of the luminous cross was a reality, has not God himself sanctioned the use of the cross as the appointed symbol of our religion? so that there is no superstition in the use of it, but the Catholics are correct and the Protestants in an error on this subject?—If God intended to enlighten *Constantine*’s dark mind and show him the truth of Christianity, would he probably use for the purpose the enigma of a luminous cross, in preference to his inspired word or a direct and special revelation? Was there no tendency to encourage a superstitious veneration for the sign of the cross, in such a miracle?—And can it be believed, that *Jesus Christ* actually appeared to the emperor in a vision, directing him to make an artificial cross, and to rely upon that

the only conclusion that remains is, that *Constantine* saw, in a dream while asleep, the appearance of a cross, with the inscription, *by this conquer*. (31) Nor is this opinion unsupported by competent authorities of good credit. (32)

§ 10. The happiness anticipated by the Christians from the edicts of *Constantine* and *Licinius*, was a little afterwards interrupted by *Licinius*, who waged war against his kinsman *Constantine*. Being vanquished in the year 314, he was quiet for about nine years. But in the year 324, this restless man again attacked *Constantine*, being urged on both by his own inclination and by the instigation of the pagan priests. That he might secure to himself a victory, he attached the pagans to his cause by severely oppressing the Christians, and by putting not a few of their bishops to death. (33) But all his plans failed. For after several unsuccessful battles, he was obliged to throw himself upon the mercy of the victor; who nevertheless ordered him to be strangled in the year 325. After his victory over *Licinius*, *Constantine* reigned sole emperor till his death; and by his plans, his enactments, his regulations, and his munificence, he endeavoured as much as possible to obliterate gradually the ancient superstitions, and to establish Christian worship throughout the Roman empire. (34) He had undoubtedly learned from the wars and the machina-

as his *defence* in the day of battle!—But how came the whole story of the luminous cross to be unknown to the Christian world, for more than twenty-five years, and then to transpire only through a private conversation between *Eusebius* and *Constantine*?—Is it not supposable, that *Eusebius* may have misunderstood the account the emperor gave him, of a singular halo about the sun which he saw, and of an affecting dream which he had the night after, and which induced him to make the *Labarum*, and use it as his standard!—Such are the arguments against this hypothesis.—*Tr.*]

(31) [*Lactantius* mentions only the dream; and the same is true of *Sozomen*, lib. i, c. 3, and *Rufinus*, in his translation of the *Eccles. History* of *Eusebius*; and likewise, of the author of the *Chronicon Orientale*, p. 57. Indeed the appeal of *Eusebius* to the solemn attestation of the emperor, (de Vita *Constantini*, l. i, c. 28), and the statement of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, (Acta Concilii Nicaeni, lib. i., c. 4, in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. i., p. 351), that the whole story was accounted fabulous by the pagans, confirm the supposition that it was a mere dream. For the appeal of *Eusebius* would have been unnecessary, and the denial of its reality by the pagans would have been impossible, if the whole army of *Constantine* had been eyewitnesses of the event.—*Schl.*]

(32) The writers who treat of *Constantine* the Great, are carefully enumerated by *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, c. 12, p. 260, &c. [The latest and by far the best, (says *Heeren*, *Ancient Hist.*, p. 475, ed. Bancroft, 1828), is,

VOL. I.—E E

Leben Constantin des Grossen, von *J. C. F. Manso*, Bresl., 1817.] *Fabricius* moreover, (ibid, c. 13, p. 273, &c.), describes the laws of *Constantine* relating to religious matters, under four heads. The same laws are treated of by *Jac. Gothofred*, *Adnot. ad Codicem Theodosianum*; and in a particular treatise, by *Francis Baldwin*, in his *Constantinus Magn. seu de Legibus Constantini Ecclesiast. et civilibus*, lib. ii., ed. 2d, by *B. Gundling*, Halle, 1727, Svo.

(33) *Eusebius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. x., c. 8, and de Vita *Constantini*, l. i., c. 49. Even *Julian*, than whom no one was more prejudiced against *Constantine*, could not but pronounce *Licinius* an infamous tyrant who was sunk in vices and crimes. See *Julian's Caesars*, p. 222, ed. Spanheim.—I would here observe, what appears to have been overlooked hitherto, that *Aurelius Victor* mentions this persecution of *Licinius*, in his *Book de Caesaribus*, c. 41, p. 435, ed. Arntzenii, where he says: *Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere*. The *Philosophers*, whom *Licinius* is here said to have tortured, were doubtless *Christians*; whom many, from their slight acquaintance with our religion, have mistaken for a sect of philosophers. The commentators on *Aurelius* have left this passage untouched; which is apt to be the case with those, who are intent only on the enlargement of grammatical knowledge derived from ancient writers.

(34) [*Constantine* doubtless committed errors, which in their consequences were injurious to the cause of Christianity. He

tions of *Licinius*, that neither himself nor the Roman empire could remain secure while the ancient superstition continued prevalent, and therefore from this time onward, he openly opposed the pagan deities and their worship, as being prejudicial to the interests of the state.

§ 11. After the death of *Constantine*, which happened in the year 337, his three surviving sons, *Constantine II.*, *Constantius*, and *Constans*, agreeably to his pleasure, assumed the empire, and were all proclaimed Augusti and emperors by the Roman senate. There were still living two brothers of *Constantine* the Great, namely, *Constantius Dalmatius* and *Julius Constans*, and they had several sons. But nearly all these were slain by the soldiers at the command of *Constantine's* sons, who feared lest their thirst for power might lead them to make insurrections and disturb the commonwealth.(35) Only *Gallus* and *Julian*, sons of *Julius Constans*, escaped the massacre;(36) and the latter of these afterwards became emperor. *Constantine II.* held Britain, Gaul, and Spain; but lost his life A.D. 340, in a war with his brother *Constantius*. *Constans* at first governed only Illyricum, Italy, and Africa; but after the fall of his brother *Constantine II.* he annexed his provinces to his empire, and thus became emperor of all the West, until he lost his life A.D. 350, in the war with *Maxentius* a usurper. After the death of *Constans*, *Maxentius* being subdued, the third brother *Constantius*, who had before governed Asia, Syria and Egypt, in the year 353 became sole emperor, and governed the whole empire till the year 361, when he died. Neither of these brothers possessed the disposition or the discernment of their father; yet they all pursued their father's purpose, of abolishing the ancient superstitions of the Romans and other pagans, and of propagating the Christian religion throughout the Roman empire. The thing itself was commendable and excellent; but in the means employed, there was much that was censurable.(37)

§ 12. The cause of Christianity which had been thus flourishing and

gave to the clergy the former privileges of the pagan priests; and allowed legacies to be left to the churches, which were everywhere erected and enlarged. He was gratified with seeing the bishops assume great state; for he thought, the more respect the bishops commanded, the more inclined the pagans would be to embrace Christianity: and thus he introduced the love of pomp and display among the clergy.—*Schl.*]

(35) ["It is more probable, that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of *Thrace*, *Macedon*, and *Achaia*, which in the division of the empire, *Constantine* the Great had given to young *Dalmatius*, son of his brother of the same name, and *Pontus* and *Cappadocia*, which he had granted to *Annibalianus*, the brother of young *Dalmatius*. Be that as it will, *Dr. Mosheim* has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of *Constantine*; whereas almost all authors agree, that neither young *Constantine*, nor *Constans*, had any hand in it at all."—*Macl.*]

(36) [Because they were despised: *Gallus* being sickly, it was supposed he would not

live long; and *Julian*, being but eight years old, created no fear. Some years after, they were sent to a remote place in *Cappadocia*, where they were instructed in languages, the sciences, and gymnastics, being in a sense kept prisoners; and were at last designed for the clerical office, having been made lecturers or readers. *Ammianus Marcell.*, l. xxii., c. 9.—*Schl.*]

(37) [Coercive measures were adopted, which only made nominal Christians. A law was enacted, in the year 342, that all the heathen temples should be shut up, and that no person should be allowed to go near them. All sacrifices, and all consultations of the oracles and the soothsayers, were prohibited on pain of death and confiscation of property: and the provincial magistrates were threatened with the same penalties, if they were dilatory in punishing transgressors of the law. This was to compel the conscience, and not to convince it. The history of these emperors may be found in the *Universal History*, and in *Le Beau's History of the Eastern Empire*.—*Schl.*]

prosperous, received immense injury and seemed on the brink of ruin, when *Julian*, the son of *Julius Constans*, brother of *Constantine* the Great, now the only surviving branch of the Constantinian family, (38) after a successful campaign in Gaul A.D. 360, was hailed emperor by his soldiers, and on the death of *Constantius*, A.D. 361, obtained possession of the whole empire. For *Julian*, though educated in the Christian religion, yet influenced partly by hatred of the Constantinian family, which had murdered his father, brother, and all his relatives, and partly by the artifices of the Platonic philosophers, who deceived this credulous and vainglorious prince with fictitious miracles and prophecies, apostatized from Christianity to paganism, and laboured to restore idolatry now ready to become extinct, to its former splendour. *Julian* seemed to abhor all violent measures, and to wish to give full liberty to the citizens of choosing their religion, and of worshipping God in the manner they pleased; but at the same time he artfully and dexterously cut the sinews of the Christian cause, by abrogating the privileges granted to this religion and to its ministers, by shutting up the Christian schools in which philosophy and the liberal arts were taught, by not only tolerating but even encouraging and animating all sectarians, by writing books against the Christians, &c. He likewise had many projects in contemplation; and would, doubtless, have done immense harm to Christianity, if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, which he undertook directly after he came to the throne. But in this war, which was both undertaken and carried on with little discretion, he fell by a wound received in battle, A.D. 363, when just entered the thirty-second year of his age, and after reigning sole emperor only twenty months from the death of *Constantius*. (39)

§ 13. Those who rank *Julian* among the greatest heroes the world has produced, nay, place him the first of all who ever filled a throne—which many at this day do, and among them are persons of learning and discernment—(40) must either be so blinded by prejudice, as not to see the truth; or

(38) [For, *Gallus*, who had been created Cæsar, was previously slain by order of *Constantius*, because of his cruelty, and being charged with aspiring after the supreme power. *Ammian. Marcell.*, l. xiv., c. 11.—*Schl.*]

(39) See, besides *Tillemont*; [the Universal History; *Le Beau*, Histoire du bas Empire, tom. iii., livr. xii–xiv.]; and other common writers; the accurately written work of *Bletterie*, Vie de Julien, Paris, 1734, and Amsterd., 1735, 8vo; the Life and Character of *Julian* the Apostate, illustrated in vii. Dissertations, by *Des Voeux*, Dublin, 1746, 8vo; *Ez. Spanheim*, Preface and Notes to the Works of *Julian*, Lips., 1696, fol., and *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, Lux salutaris Evangelii toti orbi exorientis, cap. xiv., p. 294, &c. [Add *Aug. Neander*, über Kayser Julianus und sein Zietalter, Hamb., 1812, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(40) *Montesquieu*, *Esprit des Loix*, livr. xxiv., c. 10, says: Il n'y a point eu après lui de Prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes. [To form a correct judgment of *Julian*, it is necessary cursorily to survey

the history of his life. He was born A.D. 331; and lost his mother *Basilina*, the same year; and his father, *Julius Constantius*, a few years after. *Mardonius*, a eunuch, and *Eusebius*, bishop of Nicomedia, were his first instructors. When *Gallus* was made a Cæsar, *Julian* obtained permission to come to Constantinople, where he attended the public schools; afterwards he went to Bithynia, and everywhere attached himself to the most noted teachers. He read and imitated the orations of *Libanius*, a pagan sophist, whom he was strictly forbidden to hear. At Pergamus he became acquainted with *Aedesius*, an aged Platonic philosopher; and heard his scholars, *Eusebius* and *Chrysanthus*, as also *Maximus* of Ephesus; which last initiated him in theurgia, brought him to apostatize from Christianity, and presaged his elevation to the throne. This change in his religion, he was obliged to conceal from *Constantius* and *Gallus*. *Julian* therefore devoted himself to a monastic life, assumed the tonsure, and became a public reader in the church at Nicomedia. In the year 354,

they must have never read attentively *Julian's* writings which still remain ;

after the death of *Gallus*, he was deprived of his liberty, and carried to Milan. After being in custody there seven months, by the intercession of the empress *Eusebia*, he obtained a release, and liberty to travel into Greece, where he applied himself at Athens to the sciences and to eloquence, and became acquainted with *Basil* and *Gregory* of Nazianzen. In the year 355, he was proclaimed Cæsar, and had Gaul, Spain, and Britain intrusted to him. But *Constantius* greatly limited his power, and nominated not only the military commanders there, but also the officers of *Julian's* court, who were to keep strict watch over him. To this his elevation, *Eusebia* contributed much, she being anxious about the succession to the throne, on account of her continued barrenness : and the rebellion of *Sylvanus*, which took place in the beginning of this year, as also the continual incursions of the bordering nations which required a general in Gaul, favoured the measure. *Julian* performed some successful campaigns in Gaul, which procured him the affections not only of the soldiery, but of all the Gallic subjects. This awakened the jealousy of *Constantius*, who, under pretext of the Persian war, recalled a great part of the troops from Gaul. In the spring of 360, the soldiers proclaimed *Julian* Augustus, and compelled him to assume that dignity. A reconciliation was attempted in vain. *Constantius* insisted upon it, that *Julian* should resign. *Julian* prosecuted the German war successfully, and strengthened and fortified the frontiers ; and after vanquishing the Germans, whom *Constantius* had excited against him, and subduing Illyria and Italy, he marched unencumbered against *Constantius* ; who came forward to meet him, but was taken sick on the way, and died in Cilicia. *Julian* now took quiet possession of the whole Roman empire ; caused *Constantius* to be honourably buried ; but called his principal officers to account before a special court, as the authors of numerous acts of violence. He likewise attempted great reforms in the court, in which prodigality and pomp had risen to a great height. He also dismissed many useless officers : and filled his court with philosophers and soothsayers, to whom he showed particular respect. During the Illyrian campaign, in the year 361, he publicly sacrificed to the gods ; and after the death of *Constantius*, he let it be distinctly known, that it was his purpose to reinstate idolatrous worship. But as he was aware of the ill consequences which formerly resulted from direct persecution, and wished to avoid the

repetition of them, and coveted the reputation of being magnanimous and benevolent, and as, in prospect of his Persian campaign, he stood in fear of the numerous body of Christians ; he endeavoured to assail and to undermine them, by artifice. For this purpose, he adopted the following measures. *First*, he endeavoured to reform the pagan idolatry, and to introduce improvements in it derived from the Christian worship. With this view, he attended to his official duties as Pontifex Maximus, with more earnestness than any of his predecessors, and even treated them as of more consequence than the government of the empire. He offered sacrifices daily, in his palace and garden ; attended the public sacrifices on all the pagan festivals, and officiated personally in them, without the least regard to decorum, even as to the meanest service. He re-established the public sacrifices of the cities and provinces. Where there were no temples, or where the destroyers of the ancient temples could not be found or were his own predecessors, there he erected temples at his own cost, and gave to the idolatrous priests high rank and large revenues. As he had been converted to paganism by philosophers, who were of the new Platonic School, and who held much to theurgia, magic, divination, and apparitions, and were willing to borrow from Christianity ; hence originated many burdensome purifications, and prolix ceremonies of worship, together with a considerable aping of Christian institutions. He was strenuous for the virtuous behaviour, the morality and beneficence of the priests ; and he forbid their going to theatres, or having much intercourse with those in civil authority. He wished to place the reading of useful books, giving public exhortations, and taking care of the poor, the sick, and funerals, on the same footing as they were among the Christians ; and he required, that the priests in many places should annually be supplied with corn, and wine, and money, which they were to distribute to the poor. *Secondly*, he supported and extended wider the internal divisions among the Christians. For he restored all silenced and ejected teachers, and required that such parties as had been laid under ecclesiastical censures, should be reinstated in their privileges. He wrote letters to the most noted and most restless heretics, and encouraged them to disseminate their doctrines. He allowed the leading members of the different parties to come to him, and under colour of attempting to reconcile their differences, he inflamed them more against each other. *Thirdly*, he deprived

or lastly, they do not know what constitutes true greatness and excellence. If we set aside genius—which however, as his writings show, in him was not above mediocrity—military courage, love of learning, acquaintance with that fanatical and vain philosophy called modern Platonism, and lastly patience of labour; all that remains in *Julian* was certainly little and unworthy of commendation. His excellences were counterbalanced by very great defects; first, a monstrous and almost anile superstition—the surest indication of a little mind—then, a puerile pursuit of applause and vulgar popularity, extreme credulity and instability, a disposition to use dissimulation and underhanded means, and finally, ignorance of solid and sound philosophy. I will grant, that in some respects, he was superior to the sons of Constantine the Great; but in many respects, he was inferior to *Constantine himself*, whom he censures so immoderately.

§ 14. As *Julian* affected to appear unwilling to trouble any of his subjects on account of their religion, and opposed to no sect whatever, he showed so much indulgence to the Jews, as to give them liberty to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews commenced the work, but were obliged to desist before even the foundations were laid. For balls of fire issued from the ground, accompanied with a great explosion and a tremendous earthquake, which dispersed both the materials that were collected and the workmen. The fact itself is abundantly attested; (41) though the

the clergy of the franchises and permanent incomes, which they had enjoyed under the former emperors; especially, of their exemption from burdensome civil duties, and of the distribution of corn to the churches from the emperor's storehouses; and he compelled the monks and the ministers of religion by force, to perform military duty. *Fourthly*, he excluded the Christians from all promotions, and in terms of bitter sarcasm, forbid their access to the public schools, their studying the Greek authors and sciences, and their practising physic. *Fifthly*, he commanded the idolatrous temples, images, and altars, to be rebuilt, at the cost of those who had pulled them down. *Sixthly*, acts of violence done by pagans to Christians, he either did not punish at all, or punished very slightly, only requiring them to make restitution. On the contrary, every tumult among Christians was punished most severely; and commonly, the bishops and the churches were made accountable for them. *Seventhly*, he connected idolatry with all solemn transactions, and with the manifestations of respect due to himself, and made a participation in it unavoidable. The soldiers for instance, when extraordinary gratuities were presented to them, must strew incense upon an altar; and to all the publicly exhibited pictures of the emperor, idolatrous deities were attached. *Eighthly*, he ridiculed the Christians and their worship, scornfully; and wrote books in confutation of their doctrines. His work against Christianity, which was composed in the

year 363, and in part during his Persian campaign, is lost. Indeed the Marquis d'Argen's, in the *Défense du paganisme, par l'Empereur Julien, en Grec et François, avec des Dissertations et Notes*, Berlin, 1764, 8vo, has endeavoured to recover this work, by means of the Confutation of it by *Cyril*. But the recovery is very incomplete. Yet these remains of it show, that the book was more likely to injure Christianity by the style in which it was written, and by the perversion of scripture, than by either the strength or the originality of its arguments and objections. *Ninth*, and lastly, the emperor showed much partiality to the Jews, and allowed them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, in order to confute by facts the prediction of *Christ*. Immediately after, there were banishments, tortures, and executions of Christians, under pretence that they had showed themselves refractory against the commands of the emperor; and there were many, especially in the eastern provinces, who became apostates. Yet there were not wanting resolute confessors of the Christian religion. See *Baumgarten's* Auszug der Kirchengesch., vol. ii., p. 763, 780, 792, &c.—*Schl.*]

(41) See *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Lux salutar. Evangelii toti orbi exorientis*, p. 124, where the testimonies are collected. See also the acute English knight, *Walter Moyle*, *Posthumous works*, p. 101, &c. [The principal authorities cited by *Fabricius* are, *Chrysostom*, *Homil. v. adv. Judæcos, et alibi*, *saepius*; *Ammianus Marcell.*, lib. xxiii.,

Christians as often happens in such cases, appear to have inconsiderately amplified it with some additional miracles. As to the causes which produced the event, there is room for debate, and there *is* debate. All however who weigh the subject with an impartial mind, will easily perceive, that they must join with those who ascribe the phenomenon to the omnipotent will of God; and that they who choose to ascribe it to natural causes or to artifice and fraud, offer no objections which are insurmountable. (42)

§ 15. The soldiers elected *Jovian* to succeed *Julian*. He died in the year 364, after reigning seven months; and therefore accomplished but little. (43) The other emperors of this century, who reigned after *Jovian*, were *Flav. Valentinian I.* [in the West, from A.D. 364–375, with] *Flav. Valens* [in the East, from A.D. 364–378], then *Flav. Gratian* [in the West, A.D. 375–383, with] *Flav. Valentinian II.* [also in the West, A.D. 375–392, and *Theodosius the Great*, in the East, A.D. 379–395], *Honorius*, [in the West, A.D. 395–423, with *Arcadius*, in the East, A.D. 395–408]. All these were Christians, and did much to advance the religion they professed. They all endeavoured, though not with equal zeal, to extirpate wholly the pagan religions. In this particular, *Theodosius the Great*, the last emperor of this century [in the East, except *Arcadius*], ex-

c. i.; *Gregory Naz.*, orat. iv.; *Ambrose*, Ep. 40, (al. 29, written A.D. 388); *Soerates*, H. E., lib. iii., c. 20; *Sozomen*, H. E., lib. v., c. 21; *Theodoret*, H. E., lib. iii., c. 20; *Rufinus*, H. E., lib. i., c. 37; *Philostorgius*, H. E., lib. vii., c. 9, 14; Hist. Eccles. Tripartita, l. vi., c. 43; *Nicephorus*, l. x., c. 32; *Zonaras*, l. xiii., c. 12; Rabbi *David Gantz*, Zemach David, pt. ii., p. 36; Rabbi *Gedaliah*, Schalschelet Hakkabala, p. 109.—*Dr. Lardner*, (Collection of Jewish and heathen Testimonies, vol. iv., p. 57–71, ed. Lond., 1767), maintains the whole story to be false. His chief arguments are that *Julian* only *purposed* to rebuild the temple, *after* his Persian expedition; that he needed all his resources for that expedition; the silence of *some* of the fathers, living near the time; and the decoration of the story by others of them. But these arguments seem wholly insufficient, against the explicit testimony of so many credible witnesses, Christians and pagans, and several of them contemporary with the event — *Tr.*]

(42) *Ja. Basnage*, in his *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. iv., p. 1257, &c., contests the reality of this miracle. Against him appeared *Gisb. Cuperus*, in his *Epistolae*, p. 400, edited by *Bayer*. Recently, *Wm. Warburton* has maintained the reality of the miracle, sometimes with an excess of ingenuity, in an appropriate treatise, entitled: *Julian*, or a Discourse concerning the earthquake and fiery eruption, which defeated that emperor's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem; London, 1750, 8vo.

(43) See *Bletterie*, Vie de Jovien, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1748, in which work he com-

pletes the history of *Julian*, and gives a French translation of some of *Julian's* writings.—[The following notices are worth inserting. Both during the lifetime of *Julian*, and after his death when the soldiers made him emperor, *Jovian* openly declared himself on the side of Christianity. For when *Julian* gave orders to all the military officers who were Christians, to either quit the army, or renounce their religion; *Jovian* chose to relinquish his office. But *Julian* would not release him, but gave him promotion during the Persian war. When chosen emperor, *Jovian* would not accept the office, until the army had declared themselves in favour of Christianity. When he arrived at Antioch, he repealed all the laws of *Julian*, adverse to Christianity: (*Rufinus*, lib. xi., c. 1, and *Sozomen*, l. vi., c. 3), and wrote to all the provincial governors, commanding them to take diligent care that the Christians should not be disturbed in their public assemblies. He restored to the churches, to the clergy, and to widows, all the franchises and privileges, which had been granted them by *Constantine* and his sons, but which *Julian* had taken from them. He likewise restored the use of the *Labarum*, or the standard with a cross: and he compelled one *Magnus* to rebuild the church of Berytus, at his own cost, he having commanded it to be demolished. (*Theodoret*, lib. iv., c. 19.) In regard to the religious controversies of that day, he joined with the orthodox against the Arians; and he treated *Athanasius* with peculiar respect. See *Baumgarten's* Auszug der Kirchenhistorie, vol. ii., p. 805, and the Universal History.—*Schl.*]

ceeded all the rest. He came to the throne A.D. 389—and died A.D. 395. And during his whole life, he did all he could to extirpate idolatry through all the provinces of the empire, and enacted severe laws against the adherents to it. The same design was prosecuted by his sons *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; so that in the close of this century, the ancient superstitions were ready to expire, and had lost all their respectability.(44)

§ 16. Yet this severity of the government could not prevent the existence of some pagan fanes and ceremonies, especially in the remoter provinces. Indeed, these rigorous laws against the worshippers of the pagan deities, seem to have been aimed rather against the common people, than against persons of rank and distinction. For it appears, that during the reign of *Theodosius*, as well as after his death, individuals filled the highest offices, and continued in them till old age, who are known to have been averse from Christianity and attached to paganism. Of this *Libanius* is an example, who was very hostile to the Christians, and yet was made præfect of the prætorian guards by *Theodosius* himself. Perhaps greater indulgence was shown to philosophers, rhetoricians, and military commanders, than to other people, on account of their supposed usefulness to the commonwealth.

§ 17. Yet these very rhetoricians and philosophers, whose schools were supposed to be so profitable to the community, exhausted all their ingenuity, both before the days of *Constantine* the Great, and afterwards, to arrest the progress of Christianity. In the beginning of this century, *Hierocles*, the great ornament of the Platonic school, composed two books against the Christians; in which he had the audacity to compare our Saviour with *Apollonius Tyanaeus*, and for which he was chastised by *Eusebius* [Cæsariensis] in a tract written expressly against him.(45) *Lactantius* speaks

(44) See the laws of these emperors, in favour of the Christian religion, and against the professors and friends of the ancient religion, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. vi, and *Peter* and *Jerome Ballerini*, Diss. i. in *Zenonem Veronensem*, p. 45, &c., Veronae, 1739, fol.

(45) [*Hierocles*, who flourished about A.D. 303, was governor of Bithynia, and afterwards præfect of Egypt. He was a zealous persecutor of the Christians, and wielded both the sword and the pen against them. His character and his two Books addressed to the Christians, are thus described by *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar., l. v., c. 2, 3. "He was one of the judges, and was the principal author of the persecution [under *Dialetian*]. But not content with this crime, he also attacked with his pen the people he persecuted: for he composed two Books,—not against the Christians, lest he should seem to address them as an enemy,—but to the Christians, that he might appear friendly to them and anxious for their good. In these books he endeavours to prove the falsehood of the scriptures, by making them appear full of contradictions."—"He particularly assailed *Peter* and *Paul* and the other

disciples, as disseminators of falsehood; and he accuses them of being rude and illiterate persons, because some of them had lived by fishing."—"He affirms, that *Christ* was outlawed by the Jews; and that he afterwards collected a company of 900 banditti, and became a robber."—"Also, wishing to overthrow his miracles, (which he does not pretend to deny), he attempts to show, that *Apollonius* had performed as great, and even greater."—"I do not say, (he adds), that the reason why *Apollonius* was never accounted a God, was, that he chose not to be so regarded: but I say, that we are wiser,—in not attaching at once the idea of divinity to the working of miracles,—than you are, who believe a person a God, merely on account of a few wonderful acts."—"Having poured out such erudities of his ignorance, and having laboured utterly to extirpate the truth, he has the temerity to entitle his nefarious Books, which are hostile to God, (*φιλαληθεϊς*), devoted to the truth."—*Eusebius*, *Libri contra Hieroclem*, Gr. and Lat., is subjoined to his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. Paris, 1628.—See *Lardner's Works*, vol. viii., and *Bayle*, *Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit.*, art. *Hierocles* (2d).—*Tr.*]

of another philosopher who endeavoured to convince the Christians they were in error; but his name is not mentioned.(46) After the reign of *Constantine* the Great, *Julian* wrote a large volume against the Christians, and *Himerius*(47) and *Libanius*(48) in their public declamations, and *Eunapius* in his lives of the philosophers, zealously decried the Christian religion.(49) Yet no one of these persons was punished at all, for the licentiousness of his tongue or of his pen.

§ 18. How much harm these sophists or philosophers, who were full of the pride of imaginary knowledge, and of hatred to the Christian name, did to the cause of Christianity in this century, appears from many examples, and especially from the apostacy of *Julian*, who was seduced by men of this stamp. Among those who wished to appear wise, and to take moderate ground, many were induced by the arguments and explanations of these men, to devise a kind of reconciling religion, intermediate between the old superstition and Christianity; and to imagine that *Christ* had enjoined the very same things, which had long been represented by the pagan priests under the envelope of their ceremonies and fables. Of these views were *Ammianus Marcellinus*, a very prudent and discreet man,(50) *Chal-*

(46) *Lactantius*, Institut. Divinar., lib. v., c. 2.

(47) See *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. clxv., p. 355. [The works of *Himerius* are lost.—*Tr.*]

(48) [*Libanius*, the sophist, was born at Antioch about A.D. 314, and lived probably till about the end of the century. He taught rhetoric and declamation at Nice, Nicomedia, Constantinople, Athens, and Antioch. His schools were large, sometimes amounting to more than 80 pupils; and rival sophists envied him. The emperor *Julian*, when young, was forbidden to attend the school of *Libanius*; but he obtained and read his writings, and made them his model as to style. When *Julian* came to the throne he offered *Libanius* a public office, which the sophist proudly refused. Yet the emperor and he were very good friends. *Libanius* was an inflated, pedantic man, full of himself, yet independent in his feelings, and free in the expression of his opinions. He was an avowed pagan, yet a strenuous advocate for religious toleration. His numerous writings still remain, consisting of a prolix Life of himself, a large number of eulogies and declamations, and more than a thousand letters. They seldom contain either profound or original thought, or display research; and the style is concise, affected, and pedantic. Yet they are of some use, to throw light on the times in which he lived. They were published, Gr. and Lat., vol. i., Paris, 1606, and vol. ii., by *Morell*, 1627, fol. The most complete edition of his epistles, is by *Wolf*, Amsterdam, 1738, fol. A volume containing 17 of his Declamations, was published at Venice, 1755.—See his

Life, written by himself, in his Works, vol. ii., p. 1–84. *Eunapius*, Vitae Philos. et Sophistarum, p. 130, &c., and among the moderns, *Tillemont*, Histoire des Empe-reurs, tom. iv., p. 571, &c. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., tom. vii., p. 376–414. *Lardner*, Heathen Testimonies, vol. iv., p. 127–163, and *Gibbon*, Decline and Fall of Rom. Emp., ch. xxiv.—*Tr.*]

(49) [See *Eunapius*, Lives of *Aedcsius*, *Maximus*, &c. *Eunapius* also wrote a chronicle, to which he frequently refers in his Lives of the Sophists; the first edition of which is full of reproaches against the Christians and *Constantine* the Great; the second edition is more temperate. Both editions were extant in the times of *Photius*: see his Biblioth. Codex lxxvii.—*Schl.*]

(50) [*Ammianus Marcellinus*, a celebrated Latin historian of Grecian extract, was a soldier for at least twenty years, from A.D. 350 onward, and served in the honourable corps called *Protectores Domestici*. On retiring from military life, he fixed his residence at Rome, where he lived perhaps till the end of the century. There it was he composed his faithful and valuable history. The work originally consisted of thirty-one books, and gave the Roman history from the accession of *Nerva*, (where *Suetonius* ends), to the death of *Valens*. The first 13 books, which must have been very concise, are lost. The last 18, which are more full, include the period from A.D. 353–378. The style is harsh and unpolished, and sometimes difficult; but the fidelity and accuracy of the narration render the work highly valuable. *Marcellinus* was probably a real pagan; but he was not a bigot, and he was willing to give every

cidius, a philosopher,(51) *Themistius*, a very celebrated orator,(52) and others who conceived that both religions were in unison, as to all the more important points, if they were rightly understood; and therefore held, that *Christ* was neither to be contemned, nor to be honoured to the exclusion of the pagan deities.(53)

§ 19. As *Constantine* the Great, and his sons and successors, took much pains to enlarge the Christian church, it is not strange that many nations, before barbarous and uncivilized, became subject to *Christ*.(54) Many circumstances make it probable, that the light of Christianity cast some of its rays into both Armenias, the greater and the less, soon after the establishment of the Christian church.(55) But the Armenian church first received due organization and firm establishment, in this century, near the beginning of which, *Gregory* the son of *Anax*, commonly called the *Illuminator*, [*φωστήρα*], because he dispelled the mists of superstition which beclouded the minds of the Armenians; first persuaded some private individuals, and afterwards *Tiridates* the king of the Armenians, as well as his nobles, to embrace and observe the Christian religion. He was therefore ordained the first bishop of Armenia, by *Leontius* bishop of Cappadocia; and gradually diffused the principles of Christianity throughout that country.(56)

§ 20. In the middle of this century, one *Fruventius* proceeded from

one his due, according to his best judgment. The best editions of his work, are, that of *Valesius*, republished by *Gronovius*, Leyden, 1693, fol. and 4to, and that of *Ernesti*, Lips., 1775, 8vo. See *Bayle*, Dictionnaire histor. et critique, art. *Marcellin*.—*Tr.*]

(51) [*Chalcidius*, a philosopher of the 4th century, was author of a Latin translation of the *Timæus* of *Plato*, and of a Commentary on it, which were published by *J. Meursius*, Ludg. Bat., 1617, 4to. *Dr. Mosheim's* opinion of his religious faith is farther developed in his Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia, § 31, and in his notes on *Cudworth's* Intellectual System, vol. i., p. 732, &c. *J. A. Fabricius*, (in his notes on *Chalcidius*, passim, and in his Biblioth. Latina, l. iii., c. 7, p. 557, &c.), and some others, hold that *Chalcidius* was a pagan.—*Brucker* (Hist. crit. Philos., tom. iii., p. 472, &c.) makes him a Christian, though infected with the new Platonism of his age.—*Tr.*]

(52) [*Themistius*, a Greek philosopher of Paphlagonia, called *Euphrades*, (the fine speaker), from his eloquent and commanding delivery, was made a Roman senator, and enjoyed the favour of *Constantius*, *Julian*, and the succeeding emperors, down to *Theodosius* the Great, who made him præfect of Constantinople, and appointed him tutor to his son *Arradius*. He wrote, when young, some commentaries on *Aristotle*, fragments of which are still extant, and 33 of his Orations. His works are best edited by *Harduin*, Paris, 1684, fol. He was a strenuous advocate for the free toleration of

all religions, as being all good, and tending to the same result by different ways. Concerning him and his religious views, see *Brucker's* Historia crit. philos., tome ii., p. 484, &c.—*Tr.*]

(53) [This favourite opinion of *Dr. Mosheim*, he defends more at length in his Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia, § 30, 31, 32; among his Dissert. ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes, vol. i., p. 85–216, Altonæ, 1733.—But it seems not necessary to adopt this hypothesis, which has but slender support from argument; because the Eclectic or new Platonic philosophy, might easily lead its votaries to speak in terms of moderation, and even of commendation, of the Christian religion, especially in an age when it prevailed almost universally, and was the religion of the state and of the imperial court.—*Tr.*]

(54) *Gaudentius*, Vita Philastrii, § iii. *Philastrius*, de Hæres., Præf., p. 5, ed. *Fabricii*. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 19. *Georgius Cedrenus*, Chronograph., p. 234, ed. Paris: and others.

(55) [For *Eusebius*, (Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 46), informs us that *Dionysius* of Alexandria, about the year 260, “wrote concerning penance, to the Brethren of Armenia, over whom *Meruzanes* was bishop:” and, according to the *Acta Martyrum*, some Armenians suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under *Decius*, (A.D. 250), and *Diocletian*, (A.D. 304).—*Schl.*]

(56) See *Narratio de Rebus Armeniæ*, in *Fr. Combes's*, Auctarium Biblioth. Patr. Græcor., tom. ii., p. 287, &c. *Mich. le*

Egypt into the neighbouring country of Abyssinia or Ethiopia, the inhabitants of which were called *Auxumitæ*, from their capital city *Auxuma*, and baptized both the king of the country, and very many of the nobles. Afterwards returning to Egypt, he was consecrated by *St. Athanasius*, first bishop of the Auxumitæ. From this circumstance, the Ethiopic church, even to this day, is dependant on that of Alexandria, and receives its bishop from it.(57)—In *Iberia*, a province of Asia, which is now called *Georgia*, a Christian woman who had been carried captive into that country, partly by the sanctity of her life, and partly by miracles, induced the king and his queen to renounce idolatry and embrace *Christ*, and also to send for priests from Constantinople, from whom they and their people might gain a more accurate and full knowledge of the Christian religion.(58)

§ 21. A part of the *Goths* inhabiting Thrace, Mæsia, and Dacia, [now the northeast part of Rumelia, with Bulgaria and Walachia, on the Danube], had embraced Christianity before the commencement of this century;(59) and *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the Nicene council.(60) *Constantine* the Great, after having vanquished them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians.(61) But still a large part of the nation remained estranged from *Christ*, until the times of the emperor *Valens*; who permitted them to pass the river Ister, [or Danube], and to inhabit Dacia, Mæsia, and Thrace, on condition that they would be subject to the Roman laws, and would embrace Christianity; to which condition their king *Fritigern* consented.(62) The bishop of the Goths inhabiting Mæsia, in this century, was the much celebrated *Ulphilas*; who, among other laudable deeds, gave his countrymen an alphabet of his own invention, and translated the Bible for them into the Gothic language.(63)

Quien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 419 and 1356. *J. J. Schröderi*, Thesaur. Linguae Armenicae, p. 149, &c. [*Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., ii., 8. *Moses Choronenis*, Historia Armenica, lib. iii., ed. Whistoni, Lond., 1736, 4to, p. 256, &c. *Memoires hist. et geogr. sur l'Armenie*, par *M. I. St. Martin*, Paris, 1818, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(57) *Athanasius*, Apologia ad Constantium, Opp., tom. i., pt. ii., p. 315, ed. Benedict. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., lib. i., c. 19. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., c. 24. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 23. *Job Ludolf*, Comment. ad Hist. Aethiopic., p. 281. *Jerome Lobo*, Voyage d'Abissinie, tome ii., p. 13, &c. *Justus Fontaninus*, Historia litterar. Aquileiae, p. 174. [*J. Bruce*, Travels in Abyssinia, ed. 2d, Edinb., 1804, vol. v., p. 4, &c., and vol. vii., p. 73, &c.—*Tr.*]

(58) *Rufinus*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 10. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 7. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 1333, &c. [*Theodoret*, H. E., i., c. 24.—*Tr.*]

(59) [*Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 5.—*Schl.*]

(60) [*Joh. Harduin*, Conciliorum tomus i., p. 319.—*Schl.*]

(61) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 18.

(62) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 33. *Le Quien*, Oriens Christ., tom. i., p. 1240. *Eric Benzel*, Praef. ad iv. Evangelia Gothica, (ascribed to *Ulphilas*), c. v., p. xviii., &c., ed. Oxon., 1750, 4to.

(63) *Joh. Jac. Mascovii*, Historia Germanor., tom. i., p. 317, tom. ii., note, p. 49. Acta Sanctor., March, vol. iii., p. 619. *Eric Benzel*, loc. cit., cap. viii., p. xxx. [*J. C. Zahn*, Einleitung in *Ulphilas* Bibelübersetzung, p. 4, &c., ed. Weissenfels, 1805, 4to, where is condensed, all that is stated of *Ulphilas*, and his translation, by the ancients, viz., *Philostorgius*, H. Eccl., l. ii., c. 5. *Socrates*, H. Eccl., l. ii., c. 41, and l. iv., c. 33. *Sozomen*, H. Eccl., l. iv., c. 24. l. vi., c. 37. *Theodoret*, H. Eccl., l. iv., c. 37, and others.—*Ulphilas*, (or *Ulfila*, *Urphilas*, *Gulfulas*, &c.), but should, according to *Jornandes*, be written *Wulfila*, i. e., *Wölflin*, diminutive of *Wulf* or *Wolf*, a wolf), is said by *Philostorgius*, to have descended from Christian Greeks of Sadagoltina in Cappadocia, who were carried into captivity by the Goths in the year 266. Others suppose, from his name, that he was of Gothic extract. *Philostorgius* also makes

§ 22. In the European provinces of the Roman empire, there still remained a vast number of idolaters; and though the Christian bishops endeavoured to convert them to *Christ*, the business went on but slowly. In Gaul, the great *Martin*, bishop of Tours, was not unsuccessful in this work; for travelling through the provinces of Gaul, he by his discourses, and by his miracles (if we may believe *Sulpitius Severus*), everywhere persuaded many to renounce their idols and embrace *Christ*; and he destroyed their temples, and threw down their statues.(64) He therefore merited the title of the *Apostle of the Gauls*.

§ 23. It is very evident that the victories of *Constantine* the Great, and both the fear of punishment and the desire of pleasing the Roman emperors, were cogent reasons, in the view of whole nations as well as of individuals, for embracing the Christian religion. Yet no person well informed in the history of this period, will ascribe the extension of Christianity wholly to these causes. For it is manifest, that the untiring zeal of the bishops and other holy men, the pure and devout lives which many of the Christians exhibited, the translations of the sacred volume, and the excellence of the Christian religion, were as efficient motives with many persons, as the arguments from worldly advantage and disadvantage were with some others. As for miracles, I cheerfully unite with those who look with contempt on the wonders ascribed to *Paul*, *Antony*, and *Martin*.(65) I also

him first bishop of the Goths; and says, he was ordained by the Arian, *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, in the reign of *Constantine* the Great. Others make him to have succeeded *Theophilus*, and to have flourished from the year 360 to 380. He was a man of talents and learning, an Arian, (at least in the latter part of his life), and possessed vast and salutary influence, among the Goths in Dacia, Mœsia, and Thrace. He was at the Arian Synod of Constantinople, in the year 359; and was twice sent on embassies by the nation to the imperial court. His last embassy was in the reign of *Valens*, A.D. 376, to obtain permission for the Goths to pass the Danube and settle in Mœsia. He was successful; and 200,000 Goths were admitted into the Roman empire, on conditions of obeying the Roman laws and joining the Arian interest. It is not known when he died; but some time in the reign of *Theodosius* the Great, (A.D. 379–395), he was succeeded in his episcopal office by *Theotimus*, or, as some report, by *Selinus*. He was author of a translation of the whole Bible, except the books of Kings, from Greek into the language of the Goths of Mœsia. The books of Kings were omitted by him, lest their history of wars and battles should inflame the already too great thirst of the Goths for war and carnage. The alphabet he used, was of his own devising, and formed chiefly from the Greek and Latin. Nothing remains of this translation, except a single copy, somewhat mutilated, of the iv. Gospels, called the *Codex*

Argenteus, because written in letters of silver, now at Upsal in Sweden; and a few fragments of the Epistle to the Romans, recovered from an erasure of a MS. of the eighth or ninth century. *Ulphilas's* Gospels were first published by *Fr. Junius*, Dort, 1665, 2 vols. 4to; afterwards at Stockholm, 1671, 4to; and very learnedly, Oxford, 1750, fol., and lastly, in a very convenient German edition, by *J. C. Zahn*, Weissenfels, 1805, 4to, with a complete Apparatus in the German language.—*Tr.*]

(64) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i., de Vita *Martini*, c. 13, 15, 17. Dial. ii., p. 106, &c., ed. *Hier. a Prato*, Verona, 1741, fol.—[This *Martin* was born in Sabaria in Pannonia, and brought up at Pavia in Italy. He embraced Christianity, contrary to the will of his parents; and served in the army, following the occupation of his father. He afterwards left the military life, and committed himself to the instruction of *Hilary* of Poitiers. From the Arians he suffered much persecution; and he was principally instrumental in the introduction of monasticism among the Gauls. [He was ordained bishop of Tours, A.D. 374, and died in the year 397, aged 81.] For other particulars of his life, see his biographer, *Sulpitius Severus*; also *Tillemont*, *Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tome x.; and the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 413.—*Schl.* The English reader may consult *Milner's* church history, cent. iv., ch. 14.—*Tr.*]

(65) *Hieron. a Prato*, in his preface to *Sul-*

grant, that many events were inconsiderately regarded as miracles, which were according to the laws of nature ; not to mention likewise pious frauds. Still I cannot join with such as believe, that in this age, God did never manifest his power by any extraordinary signs among Christians.(66)

§ 24. Although the Christian church within the Roman empire was involved in no severe calamities, from the times of *Constantine* the Great onward, except during the commotion of *Licinius* and the short reign of *Julian*, yet slight tempests sometimes beat upon them in certain places. *Athanaric*, for instance, a king of the Goths, fiercely assailed for a time that portion of the Gothic nation which had embraced Christianity.(67) In the more remote provinces also, the adherents to idolatry often defended their hereditary superstitions with the sword, and murdered the Christians, who in propagating their religion were not always as gentle or as prudent as they ought to have been.(68) Beyond the limits of the Roman empire, *Sapor* II. surnamed *Longævus*, the king of Persia, waged three bloody wars against the Christians in his dominions. The *first* was in the eighteenth year of his reign, [A.D. 317]; the *second* was in the thirtieth year; and the *third*, which was the most cruel, and destroyed an immense number of Christians, commenced in his thirty-first year, A.D. 330, and lasted forty years, or till A.D. 370. Yet religion was not the ostensible cause of this dreadful persecution, but a suspicion of treasonable practices among the Christians: for the Magi and the Jews persuaded the king to believe, that all Christians were in the interests of the Roman empire, and that *Symeon*, the archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of all that passed in Persia.(69)

pitus Severus, p. xiii., &c., contends zealously for the miracles of *Martin* and the others in this century. [An account of the miracles of *St. Martin*, may be found in *Sulpit. Sever.*, *Vita Martini*; and *Epistles* I.—III., and *Dialogues* II., III. The miracles of some contemporary monks of Egypt and the East, are the subject of *Dialogue* I. For the history of *Paul*, see *Jerome*, de *Vita Sti. Pauli Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.*, tom. i., and for that of *Antony*, see *Athanasius*, de *Vita Sti. Antonii Eremitæ*, in his *Opp.*, tom. ii., ed. Paris, 1627.—*Tr.*]

(66) See *Eusebius*, *Liber contra Hieroclem*, c. iv., p. 431, ed. Olearii; *Henr. Doddwell*, *Diss.* ii. in *Irenæum*, § lv., p. 195, [also *Dr. Conyers Middleton's* *Free Inquiry* into the miraculous Powers, which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church, &c., Lond., 1747, 4to: and in defence of miracles, *Dr. Wm. Doddwell's* *Answer* to *Dr. Middleton's* *Free Inquiry*, &c., 1751,

8vo, and *Church's* *Vindication* of the miraculous powers, in answer to *Middleton*, 1750, 8vo; likewise *Dr. J. Jortin's* *Remarks* on *Eccles. History*, vol. i., ed. Lond., 1805.—*Tr.*]

(67) See *Theod. Ruinart*, *Acta Martyrum sincera*; and among these, the *Acta Sti. Sabæ*, p. 598, &c.

(68) See *Ambrose*, de *Officiis*, lib. i., c. xlii., § 17; where is a noticeable statement.

(69) See *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., c. 1–13, [where is a full account.] These Persian persecutions are expressly treated of in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Ciement. Vatican.*, tom. i., p. 6, 16, 181, and tom. iii., p. 52, &c., with which however, should be compared *Steph. Evod. Asseman*, *Praef. ad Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.*, splendidly edited, Rome, 1748, 2 vols. fol., p. lxxi., &c. He has published the *Martyrologium Persicum*, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and excellent Notes.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of Literature.—§ 2. Progress of the Platonic Philosophy.—§ 3. Its Fate.—§ 4. State of Learning among Christians.—§ 5. Many illiterate Christians.

§ 1. THE Greeks and Romans of this century, who wished to pass for the *literati* of the age, devoted themselves particularly to eloquence, poetry, and history, among the fine arts. And not a few of both nations might be named, who acquired some reputation in these arts. Yet they all fell very far short of the highest excellence. The best of these poets, as *Ausonius*,⁽¹⁾ if compared with those of the Augustan age, are harsh and inelegant. The rhetoricians, abandoning wholly the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, taught the youth how to speak ostentatiously and deceptively on all subjects. And most of the historians were less attentive to method, perspicuity, and fidelity, than to empty and insipid ornaments.

§ 2. Nearly all who attempted philosophy in this century, were of the sect called Modern Platonists. It is not strange therefore, that some Platonic notions are to be met with in the works of the Christians, as well as others. Yet there were fewer of these philosophers in the West, than in the East. In Syria, *Jamblichus* of Chalcis expounded Plato, or rather palmed his own conceptions upon that philosopher.⁽²⁾ His writings show, that he was superstitious, cloudy, credulous, and of ordinary intellectual powers. He was succeeded by *Acadesius*,⁽³⁾ *Maximus*,⁽⁴⁾ and others; of

(1) [*Decius* (or *Decimus*) *Magnus Ausonius*, was a Latin poet, well born and educated at Bourdeaux, who flourished in the last half of this century. He was probably a nominal Christian, was a man of poetic genius, and much caressed and advanced to high honours by those in authority. His poems were chiefly short pieces, Eulogies, Epigrams, &c., and not devoid of merit. Yet the style attests the declining age of Roman literature. Some of the pieces are also very obscene. Edited by *Tollius*, Lugd. Bat., 1671, 4to: and Lat. and Fr. by *Joubert*, Paris, 1769, 4 vols. 12mo.—*Tr.*]

(2) [*Jamblichus*. There were three of this name; the *first* lived early in the second century; his works are now lost: the *second* probably died about the year 333, and wrote largely; the *third* was contemporary with *Julian*, and wrote the life of *Alypius* the musician. The *second* is the one intended

by *Dr. Mosheim*. He was a pagan, an enthusiast, and a great pretender to superior talents and learning. Of his works, there remain a *Life of Pythagoras*, published Gr. and Lat., with Notes, by *Kuster*, Amstelod., 1707, 4to;—*Exhortation to the study of Philosophy*; *Three Books on mathematical learning*; *Commentary on Nicomachus*; *Institutes of Arithmetic*; and a *Treatise on the Mysteries of the Egyptians and Chaldeans of Assyria*; published Gr. and Lat., with Notes, by *Tho. Gale*, Oxon., 1678, fol. See *Brueker*, *Hist. crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 260–270. *Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, vol. iv., p. 282, &c., and *Lardner's Works*, vol. viii.—*Tr.*]

(3) [*Acadesius* of Cappadocia, a disciple of *Jamblichus*, and like his master, a devotee of theurgic. See *Brueker*, *Hist. crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 270, &c.—*Tr.*]

(4) [*Maximus* of Ephesus, called the Cynic, another pretender to superhuman knowl-

whose follies *Eunapius* gives us an account. In Egypt, *Hypatia*,(5) a distinguished lady, *Isidorus*,(6) *Olympiodorus*,(7) *Synesius* a semi-Christian,(8) and others of less fame, propagated this kind of wisdom, or rather, folly.

§ 3. As the emperor *Julian* was a passionate admirer of this philosophy, (as his writings clearly show), very many were induced by his influence to vie with each other in their endeavours to set it forth in the most alluring dress.(9) But when *Julian* died, a dreadful storm burst upon the Platonists, during the reign of *Valentinian*; and several of them were arraigned and tried for their lives, on the charge of practising magic, and other crimes. In these commotions, *Maximus* the preceptor of *Julian*, among others, suffered death.(10) But it was rather the intimacy of these men with *Julian*, whose counsellors they had been, than the philosophy they embraced, which proved their ruin. Hence the rest of the sect, which had not been connected with the court, were exposed to very little danger or loss, in this persecution of the philosophers.

§ 4. The Christians, from the times of *Constantine* the Great, devoted much more attention to the study of philosophy and the liberal arts, than they had done before. And the emperors omitted no means which might awaken and cherish a thirst for learning. Schools were established in many of the towns; libraries were formed, and literary men were encouraged by stipends, by privileges, and by honours.(11) All this was requisite to the accomplishment of their object of gradually abolishing pagan idolatry; for the old religion of the pagans derived its chief support from the learning of its advocates: and moreover, if the Christian youth could find no instructors of their own religion, there was danger of their apply-

edge. He is said to have persuaded *Julian* to apostatize; and he certainly had great influence over that emperor. He was put to death, for practising magic, in the reign of *Valens*. See *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., 281, &c. *Eunapius*, (de Vitis Sophistarum), gives account of *Jumblichus*, *Aedesius*, and *Maximus*.—Tr.]

(5) [*Hypatia* of Alexandria, a lady who was thought to excel all the philosophers of her age, and who publicly taught philosophy with great applause, flourished in the close of this century, and the first part of the next. She was murdered in a tumult, A.D. 415. See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 15. *Suidas*, Art. Ὑπατία, tom. iii., p. 533. *Tillemont*, *Memoires*, &c., a l'Histoire Eccles., tom. xiv., p. 274. *Menage*, Hist. mulier. philosoph., § 49, &c., p. 494, &c., and *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 351.—Tr.]

(6) [This *Isidorus* was surnamed *Gaza*—us, from Gaza in Palestine the place of his birth. Concerning him, see *Brucker*, Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 341, &c.—*Schl.*]

(7) [*Olympiodorus*, author of a Commentary upon Plato, still preserved in MS. at Paris; and of a Life of Plato, of which a Latin version has been published. There were several persons of this name. See *Bruck-*

er, Hist. crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 490.—Tr.]

(8) [*Synesius*, of Cyrene in Africa, studied under *Hypatia*; resided at Constantinople from A.D. 397–400, as deputy from his native city; was made bishop of *Ptolemais*, A.D. 410. He wrote well for that age; though he was too much infected with the reigning philosophy. His works, as edited by *Petavius*, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1612 and 1631, fol., are de Regno, ad Arcadium Imperatorem;—Dio, vel de ipsius vitæ instituto;—Calvitii encomium; Aegyptius, sive de Providentia; de Insomniis; Epistolæ clv.; and several Discourses and Hymns.—Tr.]

(9) See *Ez. Spanheim*, Praefatio ad Opp. *Juliani*, et ad versionem Gallicam *Cesarum Juliani*, p. iii., et Adnotat., p. 234. *Bletterie*, Vie de l'Empereur Julien, livr. i., p. 26, &c.

(10) *Ammianus Marcellin.*, Hist., lib. xxix., c. 1, p. 556, ed. Valesii; and *Bletterie*, Vie de Julien, p. 30, &c., 155, 159, &c.; and Vie de Jovien, tome i., p. 194.

(11) See *Ja. Gothofred.*, on the Codex Theodos. Titles, de Professoribus et Artibus liberalibus; *Fran. Balduin.*, Constantinus Magn., p. 122, &c. *Herm. Conringius*, Diss. de studiis Romae et Constantinop., subjoined to his Antiquitatt. Academicæ.

ing to the pagan teachers of philosophy and rhetoric, to the injury of the true religion.

§ 5. Yet it must not be supposed, that the Christian church was full of literary, wise, and scientific men. For there was no law as yet, to prevent the ignorant and illiterate from entering the sacred office ; and it appears from explicit testimony, that very many of both the bishops and presbyters were entirely destitute of all science and learning. Besides, the party was both numerous and powerful, who considered all learning, and especially philosophical learning, as injurious and even destructive to true piety and godliness. All the *ascetics*, *monks*, and *eremites*, were inclined towards this party ; which was also highly favoured, not only by women, but by all those who estimate piety by the sanctity of the countenance, the sordidness of the dress, and the love of solitude—that is, by the many.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND OF ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. Form of the Christian Church.—§ 3. Conformed to the Civil Establishment.—§ 4. Administration, Internal and External, of the Church.—§ 5. Rank of the Bishop of Rome.—§ 6. Limits of his Jurisdiction.—§ 7. The Bishop of Constantinople.—§ 8. Vices of the Clergy.—§ 9. Distinguished Writers in the Greek Church.—§ 10. Principal Writers in the Latin Church.

§ 1. CONSTANTINE the Great let the form or organization of the church remain, substantially, as it had been ; yet he attempted in some respects to improve and extend it. While therefore, he suffered the church to continue to be, as before, a sort of republic within yet distinct from the political body, he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred republic, and the right of modelling and controlling it in such a manner as would best subserve the public good. Nor did any bishop call in question this power of the emperor. The people therefore, in the same manner as before, continued to elect their own bishops and teachers ; and the bishops severally in their respective districts or cities, directed and regulated all ecclesiastical affairs, using their presbyters as their council, and calling on the people for their assent. The bishops also met together in conventions or councils, to deliberate on the subjects in which the churches of a whole province were interested, on points of religious controversy, on the forms and rites of worship, and others of like import. To these minor councils of one or more provinces, there were now added, by authority of the emperor, assemblies or grand councils of the whole church, called *œcumenical* or *general councils*, the emperor having first summoned one of this character at *Nice*. For he deemed it suitable, (very probably at the suggestion of the bishops), that causes of great moment, and affecting either the church universally, or the general principles of Christianity, should be examined and decided in conventions of the whole church. There were never, indeed, any councils held, which could strictly and properly be called *universal* ; those however, whose decrees and enactments were received and approved by the whole church, or by the greatest part of it, have been commonly called *œcumenical* or *general* councils.

§ 2. Most of these rights and privileges, however, were gradually diminished very much, from the time when various disturbances and quarrels and threatening contests arose here and there, respecting ecclesiastical affairs, religious doctrines, or the elections of bishops. For as the weaker parties generally appealed to the court, this afforded to the emperors the best opportunity of restricting the power of the bishops and the liberties of the people, and of variously changing the ancient customs of the church. The bishops likewise, whose wealth and influence were not a little augmented from the times of *Constantine*, gradually subverted and changed the ancient principles of church government. For they first excluded the people altogether from having a voice in ecclesiastical affairs, and then deprived the *presbyters* of their former authority, so that they might control everything at their discretion, and in particular appropriate the ecclesiastical property to themselves, or distribute it as they pleased. Hence, at the close of this century, only the shadow of the ancient form of church government remained; and the former rights of the presbyters and the people were engrossed chiefly by the bishops; while those of the whole church passed into the hands of the emperors or their provincial governors and magistrates.

§ 3. *Constantine*, to render his throne secure and prevent civil wars, not only changed the system of Roman jurisprudence, but likewise altered in many respects the constitution of the empire.(1) And as he wished, for various reasons, to adapt the ecclesiastical administration to that of the commonwealth, it became necessary that new grades of honour and pre-eminence should be introduced among the bishops. The princes among the bishops, were those who had before held a pre-eminent rank, namely, the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; with whom the bishop of Constantinople was joined, after the imperial residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four *prætorian prefects* created by *Constantine*, and perhaps even in this century bore the Jewish title of *Patriarchs*. Next to these were the *exarchs*, corresponding with the civil *exarchs*, and presiding each over several provinces. The *metropolitans* came next, who governed only single provinces. After them ranked the *archbishops*, who had the inspection only of certain districts of country. The *bishops* brought up the rear; whose territories were not in all countries of the same extent, being in some countries more extensive, and in others confined to narrower limits. To these several orders of bishops, I should add that of the *chorepiscopi* or *rural bishops*, the superintendents of the country or suburbial churches, were it not that the bishops, in order to extend their own power, had caused this order to be suppressed in most places.(2)

(1) See *Bos*, Hist. de la Monarchie Française, tom. i., p. 64. *Giannone*, Hist. de Naples, tom. i., p. 94, 152.

(2) This is shown by *Ludov. Thomassinus*, Disciplina ecclesiæ. vet. et nova circa beneficia, tom. i., various passages.—[Though the ecclesiastical divisions of the Roman empire, did not coincide exactly with the civil divisions, yet a knowledge of the latter will help us to form a better idea of the former. Accordingly, we annex the

following account of the civil distribution copied from an ancient Notitia Imperii, said to have been written before the reign of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*, or before A.D. 395. See *Pagi*, Critica in Barronii Annal. ad. Ann. 37, tom. i., p. 29, &c.

I. *Præfectus Prætorio Orientis*: et sub eo Dioeceses quinque, ss.

1. Dioecesis orientis, in qua Provinciæ xv. nempe, Palaestina, Phœnice, Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus, Arabia, Isauria, Palaestina Sal-

§ 4. The administration of ecclesiastical affairs, was divided by *Con-*

utaris, Palaestina ii., Phoenice Libani, Euphratensis, Syria Salutaris, Osrhoëna, Mesopotamia, et Cilicia ii.

2. Dioecesis *Aegypti*, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Libya superior, Libya inferior, Thebais, Aegyptus, Arcadia, et Augustanica.

3. Dioecesis *Asiae*, in qua Provinciae x. nempe, Pamphylia, Hellespontus, Lydia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Phrygia Pacatiana, Phrygia Salutaris, Lycia, Caria, et Insulae.

4. Dioecesis *Ponti*, in qua Provinciae x. nempe, Galatia, Bithymia, Honorias, Cappadocia i., Paphlagonia, Pontus Polemoniacus, Helenopontus, Armenia i., Armenia ii., et Galatia Salutaris.

5. Dioecesis *Thraciae*, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Europa, Thracia, Hemimontis, Rhodope, Mæsia ii., et Scythia.

II. *Praefectus Praetorio Illyrici*: et sub eo Dioeceses duae, ss.

1. Dioecesis *Macedoniae*, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Achaia, Macedonia, Creta, Thessalia, Epirus vetus, et Epirus nova.

2. Dioecesis *Daciae*, in qua Provinciae v. nempe, Dacia Mediterranea, Dacia Ripensis, Mæsia prima, Dardania Praevalitiana, et Pars Macedoniae Salutaris.

III. *Praefectus Praetorio Italiae*: et sub eo Dioeceses tres, ss.

1. Dioecesis *Italiae*, in qua Provinciae xvii. nempe, Venetiae, Aemilia, Liguria, Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium, Tuscia et Umbria, Picenum Suburbicarium, Campania, Sicilia, Apulia et Calabria, Lucania et Brutii, Alpes Cottiarum, Rhaetia prima, Rhaetia secunda, Samnium, Valeria, Sardinia, et Corsica.

2. Dioecesis *Illyrici*, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Pannonia secunda, Savia, Dalmatia, Pannonia secunda, Noricum Mediterraneum, et Noricum Ripense.

3. Dioecesis *Africae*, in qua Provinciae vi. nempe, Byzacium, Numidia, Mauritania Sitifensis, Mauritania Caesariensis, Tripolis, et Africa Proconsularis.

IV. *Praefectus Praetorio Galliarum*: et sub eo Dioeceses tres, ss.

1. Dioecesis *Hispaniae*, in qua Provinciae vii. nempe, Boetica, Lusitania, Gallaecia, Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Tingitania, et Baleares.

2. Dioecesis *Galliarum*, in qua Provinciae xvii. nempe, Viennensis, Lugdunensis i., Germania i., Germania ii., Belgica i., Belgica ii., Alpes Maritimae, Alpes Penninae et Graiae, Maxima Sequanorum, Aquitania i., Aquitania ii., Novempopuli, Narbonensis i., Narbonensis ii., Lugdunensis ii., Lugdunensis iii., et Lugdunensis Senonia.

VOL. I.—G G

3. Dioecesis *Britanniarum*, in qua Provinciae v. nempe, Maxima Caesariensis, Valentia, Britannia i., Britannia ii., et Flavia Caesariensis.

Thus the *civil* division of the Roman empire was, in this century, into iv. prefectures containing 13 dioceses, which embraced 116 provinces. The *ecclesiastical* division of the empire, though founded upon the civil division, was by no means so complete and so regular. The *civil provinces* were generally *ecclesiastical provinces*, and under the inspection severally of the *metropolitans* or *archbishops* of those provinces. Yet there were many *bishops*, who were exempt from the inspection or jurisdiction of the metropolitans, and were therefore called *ἀντοκέφαλοι independent*. They also bore the title of *archbishops* and of *metropolitans*; although they had no suffragans or bishops depending on them. Above the rank of metropolitans, there were properly none other than the *patriarchs*. For the *exarchs* of Asia, Cappadocia, and Pontus, were only the *first metropolitans* of those civil dioceses, while they belonged to no patriarchate. And the *primates* of certain countries, in after ages, were only the metropolitans that ranked first, or had precedence, among the metropolitans of their respective countries.—Hence there were not properly *five* orders of bishops, above the rank of chorepiscopi, as *Dr. Mosheim* represents; but only three, namely, *patriarchs*, *metropolitans* or *archbishops*, and simple *bishops*.—Before the times of *Constantine*, provincial councils were common; and these gave rise to the order of *metropolitans*. Among the metropolitans, those of *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria* stood pre-eminent in honour and influence. During the reign of *Constantine* the Great, the powers of these three *metropolitans* were enlarged; but whether they bore the title, or possessed the authority, of *patriarchs*, at that time, is not certain. They however became *patriarchs*, both in name and in power, before a century had elapsed. And these were the three original patriarchs. Towards the close of this century, the bishops of *Constantinople* obtained rank next to those of *Rome*, and extended their authority over several dioceses not subject to the other patriarchs. In the next century, the bishops of *Jerusalem* became independent of the patriarchs of *Antioch*; and thus there were *five* patriarchates formed. Their respective limits were as follows. The patriarchal authority of the bishops of *Rome*, did not at first extend beyond Italy, perhaps not over the whole of that. For the bishops of *Afri-*

stantine into the *external* and the *internal*. (3) The latter, he relinquished to the bishops and to councils. It embraced whatever was purely religious, religious controversies, forms of worship, functions of the priests, the irregularities of their lives, &c. The *external* administration he took upon himself. It included whatever relates to the external condition of the church, or to its discipline, and also all contests and causes of the ministers of the church, both of the higher and of the lower orders, which did not respect religion and sacred functions, but property, worldly honours, and privileges, and offences against the laws, and the like. (4) He therefore and his successors, assembled councils, presided in them, assigned judges for religious disputes, decided contests between bishops and their people, determined the limits of the episcopal sees, and by the ordinary judges heard and adjudged the civil causes and common offences among the ministers of the church; but the ecclesiastical causes he left to the cognizance of the councils and bishops. Yet this famous partition of the ecclesiastical government into the *external* and the *internal* administrations, was never clearly explained and accurately defined. Hence, both

ca, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Illyricum, acknowledged no ecclesiastical head or ruler, except their own metropolitans. But after the dissolution of the western empire, the bishop of Rome found means to bring all the bishops and metropolitans of the West under his authority. This he justified, partly by claiming to be patriarch of all the West, and partly by virtue of his assumed supremacy over the whole church. The patriarchs of *Constantinople* claimed dominion over the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, which belonged to the prefecture of the East, and also over the two dioceses composing the prefecture of Illyricum. No one of these dioceses had before belonged to any patriarchate; the three former having been governed by provincial councils, in which the metropolitans of Ephesus, Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Heraclea in Thrace, had the precedence of all other metropolitans. The two other dioceses, those of Macedonia and Dacia, had been governed in a similar manner; and being afterwards claimed by the bishops of Rome, were the cause of long and violent contests between these ambitious prelates. But the patriarchs of *Constantinople* retained them, and thereby extended their dominions northward over the Russian empire. The patriarchate of *Antioch* embraced, originally, the whole diocese of the East, and likewise extended over the churches beyond the limits of the Roman empire in Asia, quite to India. But in the year 451, the patriarchate of *Jerusalem* was created out of it, embracing the whole of Palaestina i., ii., and iii., or Salutaris, and thence to Mount Sinai and the borders of Egypt. The patriarchate of *Alexandria* embraced the civil diocese of Egypt; and thence extended into Abyssinia.—Such were the territorial limits

of the five patriarchates, from the 5th century onward to the reformation. In the 11th century, *Nilus Doxopatrius*, of *Constantinople*, gives them substantially the same boundaries. From him we learn, that the patriarch of *Constantinople* then presided over 52 metropolitans, who had under them 649 suffragan bishops; and over 13 titular metropolitans, i. e., bishops who were called metropolitans and *ἀντοκέφαλοι*, but had no suffragans; and likewise 34 titular archbishops. The patriarch of *Antioch* presided over 13 metropolitans, with 139 suffragans, besides 8 titular metropolitans, and 13 titular archbishops. The patriarch of *Jerusalem* presided over 4 metropolitans with suffragans, and 25 titular archbishops. And the patriarch of *Alexandria* presided over 7 metropolitans with suffragans, and 5 titular metropolitans and archbishops. The number of suffragans in the two last patriarchates is not given. The civil distribution of the empire is given by *Pietro Giannone*, *Istoria civile di Napoli*, lib. ii., cap. i., and the ecclesiastical distrib., *ibid.*, lib. ii., cap. viii. See also *Bingham's Origines Ecclesiast.*, i. ix., c. i., § 5, 6.—*Tr.*]

(3) *Eusebius*, de Vita *Constantini Magn.*, lib. iv., c. 24.

(4) See the imperial laws, in both the *Justinian* and *Theodosian* Codes; and, among others, *Ja. Gothofred.*, ad *Codicem Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 55, 58, 333, &c. [This whole system resulted, in part, from the office of *Pontifex Maximus*, which was retained by *Constantine* and all his successors till into the fifth century; and, in part from the conception of *Constantine*, that the church was a society existing independently of the state. See *Bos*, Diss. de *Pontificatu maximo Imperator. Christianor.*—*Schl.*]

in this and in the following centuries, we see many transactions which do not accord with it, but contravene it. For the emperors, not unfrequently, determined matters relating to the interior of the church; and on the other hand, councils and bishops often enacted laws respecting things which seem to belong to the external form and affairs of the church.

§ 5. The first among the bishops, in respect to rank and dignity, was the bishop of Rome. And this pre-eminence was not founded solely on popular feeling and prejudice of long standing, to which various causes had given rise, but also on those grounds, which commonly give priority and greatness in the estimation of mortals. For he exceeded all other bishops, in the amplitude and splendour of the church over which he presided, in the magnitude of his revenues and possessions, in the number of his assistants or ministers of various descriptions, in the weight of his influence with the people at large, and in the sumptuousness and magnificence of his style of living.(5) These indications of power and worldly greatness were so fascinating to the minds of Christians, even in this age, that often most obstinate and bloody contests took place at Rome, when a new pontiff was to be created, by the suffrages of the priests and people. A shocking example of this is afforded by the disturbance at Rome in the year 366, after the death of *Liberius*. When they came to the choice of a new bishop, one party was for placing *Damasus*, and another for appointing *Ursicinus*, a deacon, over the widowed church: and the contention issued in a bloody warfare, in which there was fighting, burning of buildings, and many lost their lives. *Damasus* came off victorious in the contest; but whether his claims were better, or his cause more righteous, than those of *Ursicinus*, does not appear.(6) I dare not pronounce either of them a good man.

§ 6. It is however abundantly attested, that the bishops of Rome did not, in this age, possess supreme power and jurisdiction in the church. They were citizens of the commonwealth; and though higher in honour, they obeyed the laws and the mandates of the emperors, just like other citizens. The more weighty religious causes were determined, either by judges appointed by the emperor, or in ecclesiastical councils; minor causes were decided by individual bishops. The laws relating to religion, were enacted either by the emperors or by councils. No one of the bishops acknowledged, that his authority was derived from the plenary power of the Roman bishop, or that he was constituted a bishop *by the favour of the apostolic see*. On the contrary, they all maintained, that they were the ambassadors and ministers of *Jesus Christ*, and that their authority was derived from above.(7) Yet it is undeniable, that even in this age,

(5) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Hist., l. xxvii., c. 3.

(6) See the writers of Lives of the Popes, among whom *Arch. Bower* has stated this matter ingenuously and impartially, in his Hist. of the Popes, vol. i., p. 180, &c., ed. 2, Lond., 1749. [*Ammianus Marcellinus*, Hist., l. xxvii., c. 3, says, that 137 corpses of the slain, were found in one day, in the church of *Sicinius*.—*Tr.*]

(7) All these points are discussed at large, by many writers, among whom I will name

Peter de Marca, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii; *L. E. du Pin*, de antiqua ecclesiæ Disciplina; and especially, *Dav. Blondell*, de la Primauté dans l'Eglise,—a very learned work: [also *Fred. Spanheim*, Diss. de Primatu Papæ, et Canone vi. Nicaeno.—*Schl.* The sixth canon of the council of *Nice*, A.D. 325, gave to the bishops of *Alexandria*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*, severally, the same pre-eminence over their respective surrounding bishops. *Meletius* had encroached upon the prerogatives of his metropolitan of Alex-

several of those steps were laid, by which the Roman pontiffs afterwards mounted to the summit of ecclesiastical dominion; and this, partly by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the sagacity of the pontiffs themselves, and partly by the hasty decisions of certain bishops. Among these steps however, I would assign either no place, or only the very last, to the *fourth canon* of the council of *Sardica*, in the year 347, to which the friends of the Roman pontiff assign the *first* and the most important place. For, not to mention that the authority and regularity of this council are very dubious, and that not without reason the enactments of this council are regarded by some as coming to us corrupted, and by others as forged; (8) it can never be made to appear from that canon, that the bishops assembled at *Sardica* decided, that in all cases an appeal might be made to the Roman pontiff, as the supreme and final judge. But suppose they had so decided—which yet can never be proved—how weak must that right be, which is founded only on the decision of a single obscure council. (9)

§ 7. *Constantine* the Great, by transferring the imperial residence to *Byzantium* and there founding the new city of *Constantinople*, undesignedly raised up against the rising power of the Roman pontiff a powerful competitor, in the bishop of the new metropolis. For as the emperor wished his *Constantinople* to be a new *Rome*, and had endowed it with all the privileges and honours and elegances of old *Rome*; the bishop of so great a city, which was the imperial residence, also wished to be thought every way equal to the bishop of old *Rome* in rank, and to have precedence of all other bishops. Nor did the emperors disapprove of this ambition, because they considered their own dignity as involved in that of the bishop of their metropolis. Therefore in the council of *Constantinople*, as-

andria: and therefore the council ordain, (according to the translation of *Dionysius Exiguus*), *Antiqua consuetudo servetur per Ægyptum, Libyam, et Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem et apud Antiochiam, cæterasque provincias, suis privilegia serventur ecclesiis.* To reconcile this canon with the papal claims of universal empire, the Romanists tell us, it relates merely to the patriarchal or metropolitical power of the bishop of *Rome*, and not to his power as *pope*:—a distinction, which does not appear to have occurred to the *Nicene fathers*. See *Natalis Alexander*, *Hist. Eccles.*, cent. iv., *Dissert.* xx.—*Tr.*]

(8) See *Mich. Geddes*, *Diss. de Canonibus Sardicensibus*; among his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. ii., p. 415; [and *Arch. Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*,—*Pope Julius*, vol. i., p. 120, &c., ed. 2, *Lond.*, 1749, 4to.—*Tr.*]

(9) [This council was got up by *Julius*, bishop of *Rome*; and was designed to be a general council, and was therefore held at *Sardica* in *Illyricum*, as accommodating both the East and the West; but as most of the eastern bishops withdrew from it, it was rather a council of the West. Its decrees

were not confirmed by several subsequent councils, nor received by the whole church. See *De Marca*, de *Concordia Sacerdotii*, &c., lib. vii., c. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15. By the 3d canon in the *Greek* or the 4th in the *Latin* translation by *Isidorus*, it was ordered, that if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, and wish for a new trial, his judges shall acquaint the bishop of *Rome* therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order a new trial before such of the neighbouring bishops as he may choose to name. The 4th canon, according to the *Greek*, adds that in such case the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant, till the determination of the bishop of *Rome* is known. By the 5th canon, according to the *Greek*, and the 7th of *Isidorus*, it is ordered, that if a condemned bishop apply to *Rome* for relief, the bishop of *Rome* may, if he see fit, not only order a new trial, but if the aggrieved bishop desire it, he may send one of his presbyters to sit and have a voice in the second trial. See *De Marca*, loc. cit., cap. 3.—Thus these canons do not give the bishop of *Rome* even an *appellate jurisdiction*, but only the power to decide whether an injured bishop shall have a new trial.—*Tr.*]

sembled in the year 381 by authority of the emperor *Theodosius* the Great, the bishop of Alexandria not being present, and the bishop of Rome being opposed to it, the bishop of Constantinople, by the third canon, was placed in the first rank after the bishop of Rome; the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, of course, to take rank after him. The bishop who had this honour conferred on him, was *Nectarius*. His successor, *John Chrysostom*, went farther, and subjected all Thrace, Asia, [the Diocese of the western part of Asia Minor], and Pontus to his jurisdiction.(10) The subsequent bishops of Constantinople gradually advanced their claims still farther. But this revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and the sudden elevation of the Byzantine bishop to high rank, to the injury of others, in the first place fired the Alexandrine prelates with resentment against those of Constantinople; and in the next place, it gave rise to those unhappy contests between the pontiffs of old and new Rome, which, after being protracted through several centuries with various success, finally produced a separation between the Latin and the Greek churches.

§ 8. The vices and the faults of the clergy, especially of those who officiated in large and opulent cities, were augmented in proportion to the increase of their wealth, honours, and advantages, derived from the emperors and from various other sources: and that this increase was very great, after the times of *Constantine*, is acknowledged by all. The *bishops* had shameful quarrels among themselves, respecting the boundaries of their sees and the extent of their jurisdiction; and, while they trampled on the rights of the people and of the inferior clergy, they vied with the civil governors of provinces, in luxury, arrogance, and voluptuousness.(11) The *presbyters*, in many places, arrogated to themselves a dignity and authority equal to bishops. Of the pride and effeminacy of the *deacons*, we often meet with various complaints. Those especially who ranked first among the presbyters and deacons, were unwilling to be considered as belonging to the same order with the others; and therefore, they not only assumed the titles of *archpresbyters* and *archdeacons*, but they thought themselves authorized to assume far greater liberties, than were allowed to the others.

§ 9. Among the eminent writers of this century who were an ornament to the eastern provinces and to Greece, the most distinguished were those whose names here follow. *Eusebius Pamphili*, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, a man of vast reading and erudition, and one who has acquired immortal fame by his labours in ecclesiastical history, and in other branches of theological learning. Yet he was not free from errors and defects; and he leaned towards the side of those who think there is subordination among the three persons in the Godhead. Some rank him among the

(10) See *Peter de Marca*, Diss. de Constantin. Patriarchatus institutione; annexed to his work, de Concordia sacerdotii et imperii, vol. iv., p. 163, &c., ed. Bamb., 1789. *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 15, &c. *Sam. Parker*, An account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years, p. 245, Lond., 1683, 8vo. [The canon of the council was thus expressed: "Constantinopolitanæ civitatis Episcopum habere oportet primatûs honorem

post Romanum Episcopum, propterea quòd sit nova Roma."—Tr.]

(11) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Historia Sacra, lib. i., c. 23, lib. ii., c. 32, 51, Dialog. i., c. 21. Add to this the account given by *Dav. Clarkson*, in his Discourse on Liturgies, p. 228, (of the French edition), of the extremely corrupt state of morals among the clergy; and in particular of the eagerness of the bishops to extend the boundaries of their authority, p. 150, &c.

Arians; but they certainly err in so doing, if they intend by an Arian, one who embraces the opinions taught by *Arius*, the presbyter of Alexandria. (12) *Peter*, bishop of Alexandria, who is highly extolled by *Eu-*

(12) No one has with more zeal and learning accused *Eusebius* of Arianism, than *Joh. le Clerc*, in his *Epistolæ Ecclesiast.* annexed to his *Ars Critica*, ep. ii., p. 30, &c. To him, add *Natalis Alexander*, *Hist. Eccles. N. Test.*, Saec. iv., Diss. xvii. All however that these and others labour to prove is, that *Eusebius* thought there was some disparity and a subordination among the persons of the Godhead. And suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not follow that he was an *Arian*, unless the term be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. It is to be lamented that so many abuse this term, and apply it to persons who, though in error, are very far from holding the opinions of Arius.—[*Eusebius Pamphili* (ss. *amicus*, φίλος) was born, probably, about the year 270, and at Cæsarea, where he spent nearly all his life. Till about forty years of age, he lived in great intimacy with the martyr *Pamphylus*, a learned and devout man of Cæsarea, and founder of an extensive library there, from which *Eusebius* derived his vast stores of learning. *Pamphylus* was two years in prison, during which *Eusebius* was constantly with him. After the martyrdom of his friend, in the year 309, *Eusebius* fled first to Tyre, and thence to Egypt, where he lived till the persecution subsided. After his return to Cæsarea, about the year 314, he was made bishop of his own city. In the year 325, he attended the council of Nice, was appointed to deliver the address to the emperor on his entering the council, and then to be seated at his right hand. The first draught of the Nicene creed was made by him; to which however, the term *ὁμοούσιον* and the *anathemas* were added by the council, and not without some scruples on the part of *Eusebius*. Afterwards *Eusebius* appeared to belong to a moderate party, who could not go all lengths with either side. About the year 330, he was offered the patriarchal chair of Antioch; which he refused, because the ancient customs forbid the removal of bishops from one see to another. He died about the year 340.—The opinion advanced by *Dr. Mosheim*, respecting the Arianism of *Eusebius*, is supported at length, by *Soerates* among the ancients, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii, c. 21, and by *W. Cave*, in his *Diss. de Eusebii Caesariensi*, Arianismo, adv. *Joh. Clericum*; and in his *Epistola apologet. ad eundem*; both are annexed to his *Historia literar. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*—Of the numerous works of *Eusebius*, the following have been preserved.

1. *Chronicon*: originally in two parts; the first, a brief history of the origin and revolutions of all nations; and the second, a full chronological table of the same events. Little of the original Greek remains; but we have the Latin translation of the second part, by *Jerome*; which, with what could be gleaned of the Greek, and considerable additions from other ancient chroniclers, was published by *Jos. Scaliger*, 1606, fol., and a 2d ed. by *Morus*, 1658. The entire *Chronicon* has been preserved in an Armenian translation; and was published, Armen. and Lat., with notes, Venice, 1817, 2 tom. fol.

2. *Præparatio Evangelica*, in 15 books; intended to prepare the minds of pagans to embrace Christianity, by showing that the pagan religions are absurd, and far less worthy to be received than the Christian. It is a learned and valuable work; published, Gr. and Lat., by *F. Vigerus*, Paris, 1628, fol., and again, Cologne (Leipsic), 1688.

3. *Demonstratio Evangelica*, in 20 books, of which the last 10 are lost. This is an attempt to demonstrate the truth of the Christian religion, by arguments drawn from the Old Test., and was therefore intended especially for the Jews. It is far less valuable than the former: ed. Paris, 1628, and Cologne, 1688, fol.

4. *Contra Hieroclem Liber*; in defence of Christianity, against the attack of that pagan philosopher. See the article *Hierocles*, supra, p. 223, note (45). It is published Gr. and Lat., annexed to the *Demonstratio Evang.*, and by *Godf. Olearius*, with the works of the two *Philostatus*, Lips., 1709, fol.

5. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in 10 books, from the birth of *Christ*, to the death of *Licinius* in 324. A most valuable treasure; though less full and complete, than could be wished. *Eusebius* was an impartial historian, and had access to the best helps for composing a correct history which his age afforded. See *Ch. Aug. Kestner*, *Commentatio de Eusebii Historiæ Eccles. conditoris Anctoritate et Fide diplomatica, sive de ejus Fontibus et Ratione, qua eis usus est*; Gotting., 1816, 4to.—This work, with the three following, was best edited, Gr. and Lat., by *Valesius*, Paris, 1659 and 1671; Amsterd., 1695, and with improvements by *W. Reading*, Cambridge, 1720, 3 vols. fol.—including the other Gr. Ecclesiastical historians; namely, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, *Evagrius*, *Theodorus Lector*, and *Philostorgius*. Those of *Euseb.*, *Socrat.*,

sebius. (13) *Athanasius*, bishop of Alexandria, famous, among other writings and acts, for his very strenuous opposition to the Arians. (14) *Basil*, sur-

Sozom., and Evag., with the three following works, were translated into English, Cambr., 1683, 1 vol. fol.

6. *De Martyribus Palaestinae* Liber: usually appended to the eighth Book of his Hist. Eccles. It gives account of the sufferers in the East and in Egypt, during the persecution of *Diocletian*, or A.D. 303-313.

7. *De Vita Constantini Magni*, libri iv.; a panegyric, rather than a biography.

8. *Oratio de Laudibus Constantini*; delivered on the emperor's vicennalia, A.D. 335.

9. *Contra Marcellum*, libri ii.; composed by order of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 336, by which Marcellus was condemned as a Sabellian: annexed, Gr. and Lat., to the Paris edition of the *Præp. Evang.*, 1628.

10. *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, libri iii. This also is in confutation of Marcellus' opinions; and is printed with the former, Gr. and Lat., subjoined to the *Præp. Evang.*

11. *De Locis Hebraicis*; a kind of Biblical Gazetteer of Palestine: edited with the Latin translation of *Jerome*, by *Bonfrerius*, Paris, 1631.

12. *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*; ed. by *Meursius*, Leyden, 1617, 4to.

13. *Vitæ Prophetarum*, ascribed to *Euseb.*, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1580, fol., with the Comment of *Procopius* in Isaiah.

14. *Canones sacrorum Evangeliorum*: tables showing what portions of the Gospel History are narrated by one, by two, by three, or by four Evangelists. The Latin translation of *Jerome* was published in the *Orthodoxographia*, in the Works of *Jerome*, and in *Biblioth. Patrum*.

15. *Apologiae pro Origene* liber primus; (the other five Books are wholly lost); the Latin translation of this, by *Rufinus*, is published among the works of *Jerome*.

16. *Commentarii in Psalmos* cl. (but all beyond ps. 119 is lost), published, Gr. and Lat., by *Montfaucon*, Collect. Nov. Gr. Patrum, tom. i., Paris, 1706, fol.

17. *Commentarii in Isaiam*; ed., Gr. and Lat., by *Montfaucon*, ubi supra, tom. ii.

18. *Fourteen Latin Essays or Discourses* against Sabellianism, &c., were published by *Sirmond*, Paris, 1643, 8vo, under the dubious title of *Eusebii Caesariensis Opuscula*, xiv.

19. *Eclogarum prophetiarum de Christo*, libri iv., (a collection and explanation of the O. T. prophecies concerning *Christ*), is said to exist in MS. in the *Bibliotheca Viennensis*.

20. *Epistola ad Caesarienses*; a letter to

his own church, concerning the Nicene creed; extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 8. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 12, et inter *Opera Athanasii*, tom. i., p. 238, ed. Paris.

Eusebius wrote many other works which have not reached us: namely, de *Præparatione Ecclesiastica* libri aliquot; de *Demonstratione Ecclesiastica*.—contra *Porphyrium*, libri xxv.; de *Evangeliorum dissonantia*; *περὶ Θεοφανείας*, libri v.; *Comment*, in i. *Epist.* ad *Corinth.*—*περὶ τοτικῶν ὀνομάτων*, liber primus, (the first part of No. 11);—de *vita Pamphili*, libri iii.; *Confutationis et Apologiae*, libri ii., (probably, a defence of himself against the charge of Arianism);—*Antiquorum Martyriorum Collectio*, (said to be in eleven Books); *Acta Martyrii Sti Luciani*; *Descriptio Basilicæ Hierosolym.*—Do *Festo Paschale* Liber; *Epistola ad Constantium de imagine Christi*; *Epistola ad Alexandrum Ep. Alex.* de *Ario*; *Epistola ad Euphratemonem*, (extracts from these 3 *Epistles* are found in the *Acta Concilii Niceni* ii. *Actione 6ta*)—*Tr.*]

(13) *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. ix., c. 6.—[*Peter* succeeded *Thomas* in the chair of Alexandria, in the year 300; was imprisoned in the year 303, and whether released or not, before his martyrdom in 311, is uncertain. He is represented as a very learned, pious, and active bishop. Of his writings, nothing remains but some rules respecting penance, and other points of ecclesiastical discipline, to be found in the collections of the ancient canons and decrees of councils.—*Tr.*]

(14) The accounts given of *Athanasius* by the Oriental writers, are collected by *Euseb. Renaudot*, in his *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinorum*, p. 83. All the works of *Athanasius* were splendidly published in three volumes folio, by the Benedictine monk, *Bernh. de Montfaucon*.—[*Athanasius* was born at Alexandria about the year 298. He had a good education, and early displayed great strength of mind, and uncommon sagacity as a disputant and a man of business. He was ordained a deacon in 319, and became the confidant and chief counsellor of his bishop *Alexander*, whom he accompanied to the council of Nice in 325. In that council he was very active, and acquired great reputation. In the year 326, *Alexander* died; and from his recommendation, *Athanasius* succeeded to the see of Alexandria, when only 27 or 28 years old. For half a century, he was the head of the orthodox party in the Arian controversy.

named the *Great*, bishop of Cæsarea [in Cappadocia], who was inferior to few of this century in felicity of genius, skill in debate, and eloquence. (15) *Cy-*

This rendered him extremely odious to the Arians, and involved him in controversy and sufferings nearly all his life. False accusations were raised against him; and a council was held at Cæsarea A.D. 334, before which he was summoned, but would not appear. The next year, by peremptory command of the emperor *Constantine*, he appeared before the council of Tyre, and answered to the charges of murder, unchastity, necromancy, encouraging sedition, oppressive exactions of money, and misuse of church property. Though his defence was good, he could not obtain justice; and he therefore fled to Constantinople, imploring the protection of the emperor. Here a council was assembled in 336, and a new charge falsely preferred against him, namely, that he prevented the shipments of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople. He was unjustly condemned, and banished to Treves in Belgium. *Arius* died that year, and *Constantine* the Great the year following. In the year 338, the sons of *Constantine* allowed *Athanasius* to return to Alexandria. He immediately began to displace Arians, and to recall the churches to the faith. Disturbances ensued; *Athanasius* was again accused; and he made application to the bp. of Rome for aid. In 341, the council of Antioch decreed, that no bishop who had been deposed by a council, ought ever to return to his see; and on this ground, the see of Alexandria was declared vacant, and one *Gregory* of Cappadocia appointed to it. *Gregory* took forcible possession of it, and *Athanasius* fled to Rome for protection. A provincial council held there, acquitted him on all the charges of his adversaries; and three years after, A.D. 344, a much larger council held at Sardica, did the same. In 347, after an exile of 7 or 8 years, *Athanasius* was permitted by the Arian emperor *Constantius*, to return to his see. But in 350, on the death of *Constans*, he was again accused and persecuted. *Constantius* caused him to be condemned in a council at Arles in 354, and at the council of Milan in 355. *Athanasius* concealed himself at Alexandria two years, and then retired among the hermits of Egypt, till the death of *Constantius* in 361. In this retirement, he wrote most of his best works. On the accession of *Julian*, in 361, he returned to his flock. But the next year, the pagans joining the Arians, induced *Julian* to banish him again. But *Julian* died the same year, and *Athanasius* returned immediately to his see. In the year 367, the Arian emperor

Valens made some attempts to remove him, but without success. He died A.D. 373, aged about 75, having been a bishop 46 years. He was truly a great man, a good bishop, and a most able, persevering, and successful defender of the orthodox faith, in respect to the Trinity. His works are chiefly controversial, and in relation to that one doctrine. They consist of numerous letters and tracts, together with some brief expositions of the Scriptures, and a Life of *St. Anthony*. His four Orations, or Discourses, against the Arians, and his Discourse against the pagans, which are his largest works, were translated into English by *Sam. Parker*, and printed at Oxford, 1713, 2 vols. 8vo. His works, Gr. and Lat., two volumes in 3 parts, were best published by *Montfaucon*, Paris, 1698; and Padua, 1777, fol. But a great number of letters, tracts, comments, and narratives, the production of subsequent ages, are falsely ascribed to him, and printed with his works. Among these, beyond all question, is the creed, *quicumque vult*, falsely called the *Athanasian Creed*. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.*, i., p. 189. *Oudin*, de *Scriptor. Eccles.*, tom. i., p. 312. *Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, vol. v., p. 297. *Montfaucon*, *Praef. ad Opp. Athanasii*; and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xii., p. 93–252. Also *Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire*, ch. xxi., vol. ii., p. 258–275, ch. xxiii., p. 355, &c., ch. xxiv., p. 406, &c., ed. 1826, in 6 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(15) His works are published by the Benedictine monk, *Julian Garnier*, Paris, [1721–1730], 3 vols. fol. [*Basil* was born at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, about A.D. 329, and died archbishop of that church, A.D. 379, aet. 50. His first instruction in religion was from his grandmother *Maerina*, a hearer and admirer of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*. His father, whose name was *Basil*, instructed him in the liberal arts. Thence he went to Constantinople or to Cæsarea in Palestine, and studied under *Libanius*, the philosopher and rhetorician. Next he studied at Athens, under *Himerius* and *Proaeresius*, having *Gregory Naz.* and *Julian* the apostate, for fellow-students in language, eloquence, poetry, history, and philosophy. In the year 355, he returned to Cappadocia, taught rhetoric a short time, and then retired for 13 years to a monastery in Pontus. From this time he became a most rigid ascetic, and a very zealous monk. He founded several monasteries, and composed rules and regulations for monks. In 363 he was called to Cæsarea, and ordained a presbyter;

rillus, bishop of Jerusalem, has left us some catechetical discourses, which he delivered at Jerusalem; but many suspect him of intimacy with the Semiarrians. (16) *John*, for his eloquence surnamed *Chrysostom*, a man of genius, who presided over the church of Antioch and that of Constantinople, and has left us various specimens of his erudition, among which his public discourses which he delivered with vast applause, stand conspicuous. (17)

the next year, falling out with his bishop, *Eusebius*, he retired to his monastery, but was soon recalled by the bishop. He was now a very popular and efficient preacher. On the death of archbishop *Eusebius*, in the year 370, *Basil* was raised to the archiepiscopal chair. He still dressed and lived like a monk, but was a most active and efficient bishop. He reformed the morals of the clergy, established rigid discipline in the churches, promoted orthodoxy and harmony in that jarring age, established almshouses for the sick and indigent; and died triumphantly, on the first of January, 379. Eulogies of him were composed by *Gregory Naz.*, *Gregory Nyssen*, (who was his brother), *Ephraem Syrus*, and *Amphylochius*. He was a fine belles lettres scholar, an elegant writer, and a good reasoner. His works that remain are numerous, consisting of near a hundred discourses, sermons, and homilies, 365 epistles, various ascetic tracts, controversial pieces, a liturgy, &c. One of his best pieces is, his treatise on the person and offices of the Holy Spirit. He is unequal in his performances, and comes much short of *Chrysostom* as an orator. Yet his enthusiasm, his flexibility of style, and his clear and cogent reasoning, notwithstanding the gloomy austerity of his monastic character, entitle him to that high rank among the ancient clergy, which has ever been assigned him. See *Godf. Hermant*, Vie de S. Basile le Grand, Archevêque de Cesarée en Cappadoce, et celle de S. Gregoire de Nazianze, Archev. de Constantinople, Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 4to. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. viii., p. 60, &c. *Jul. Garnier*, Vita Sti. Basilii, prefixed to the 3d vol. of his Opp. Basilii, Paris, 1730; and *Schroeckh*, Kirchen., vol. xiii., p. 1-214. *Milner's Church History*, cent. iv., ch. 23. For his character as a pulpit orator, see *Bernh. Eschenberg*, Gesch. der Religionsvortrag, p. 150-162, Jena, 1785, 8vo. and *J. W. Schmidt*, Anleitung zum populären Kanzelvortrag, pt. iii., p. 87-90, ed. 2. Jena, 1800, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(16) The later editions of his works, are, in England, by *Tho. Milles*, [Oxford, 1703, fol.] and in France, by the Benedictine *August. Toutte*, [Paris, 1720, fol.—*Cyril* is supposed to have been born at Jerusalem about the year 315. He was made deacon in the church of Jerusalem about A.D.

335, and presbyter, perhaps 3 years after. On the death of *Maximus* the bishop, *Cyril* was raised to the episcopal chair. But the Arian controversy, and his contest with *Acacius* of Cæsarea respecting the priority of their episcopal sees, caused him to be twice deposed, (A.D. 357 or 358, and 360), and to be expelled from his see by the emperor *Valens* in 367. But he returned after short intervals to his charge; and from 378, sat peaceably in his chair, till his death A.D. 386.—He appears to have been truly orthodox, though not disposed to go to extremes. (*Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 26, and l. v., c. 9.) Of his works, we have 23 Lectures to Catechumens; the first 18, on the creed of his church, (which was very nearly the same with what we call the Apostles' Creed), and the other 5, to the newly baptized, on the ordinances, baptism, chrism (or confirmation), and the Lord's Supper. These lectures, though written when *Cyril* was a young man, and only a presbyter, about the year 348 or 349, are an invaluable treasure to us; as they are the most complete system of theology, and most circumstantial account of the rites of the church, which have reached us from so early an age. They are plain, didactic treatises, well adapted to the object for which they were written. See *Tzschirner*, de Claris Vet. Eccl. Oratoribus, Commentatio vii., Lips., 1821, 4to. Besides these lectures, a letter of his to the emperor *Constantius*, giving account of a marvellous appearance of a luminous cross in the heavens, A.D. 351; and a discourse he delivered at Tyre: are preserved. See *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Toutte*, preface to *Cyril's Works*; and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. xii., p. 343-444.—*Tr.*]

(17) For the best edition of the entire works of this most elegant and gifted man, in 11 [13] large folio volumes, we are indebted to the industry of *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, [Paris, 1718-38 — *John Chrysostom* was the son of a respectable military gentleman of Antioch in Syria, named *Secundus*. He was born in the year 354, and lost his father in his childhood. Early displaying marks of uncommon genius, his mother *Anthusia*, a pious and excellent woman, procured for him the best instructors in all branches of learning. After spending three

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamina in Cyprus, has described the various sects of Christians, as far down as his own times, in a large volume; which however contains many defects and misrepresentations, arising from the credulity and ignorance of the author. (18) *Gregory of Nazianzus*, and

years in the family, and under the religious instruction of *Meletius* the bishop of Antioch, he attended the schools of *Libanius*, in rhetoric, of *Andragathias*, in philosophy, and of *Carterius* and *Diodorus*, (afterwards bishop of Tyre), in sacred literature, who taught him to construe the scriptures literally. Distinguished as a scholar, he was also early pious; and about the age of twenty, embracing a monastic life, he retired to the mountains and spent four years in the society of an aged hermit, and two years more in a solitary cave. Nearly worn out by his austerities, he was obliged to return to Antioch, where he was made a deacon in 381, and commenced author at the age of 26. Five years after he was ordained a presbyter, and began to preach. During twelve years he wrote and delivered an immense number of sermons, orations, and homilies. In A.D. 398, he was made patriarch of Constantinople, and in that station laboured and preached incessantly. But his life was too austere, his preaching too pungent, and his discipline too strict, for that corrupt metropolis. The empress, the lax clergy, and many courtiers combined against him. In the year 403, he was summoned before an irregular council, to answer to 46 frivolous or false charges; and refusing to appear, he was condemned, deposed, and banished, for contumacy. But his people were so tumultuous, that his enemies were compelled to recall him. The next year, however, A.D. 404, he was forcibly removed to Cucusus in Armenia, to the unspeakable grief of all good men. Here he suffered extremely, his health failed, and being removed to Pityus in Colchis, he died on the road thither, the 14th of September, 407, aged 52 years and 8 months. For overpowering popular eloquence, *Chrysostom* had no equal among the fathers. His discourses show an inexhaustible richness of thought and illustration, of vivid conception, and striking imagery. His style is elevated, yet natural and clear. He transfuses his own glowing thoughts and emotions into all his hearers, seemingly without effort, and without the power of resistance. Yet he is sometimes too florid, he uses some false ornaments, he accumulates metaphors and illustrations, and carries both his views and his figures too far. The spirit of the man, and some idea of his style, may be learned from the following literal translation of a paragraph in one of his private letters to a friend, written during his

exile.—“When driven from the city, I cared nothing for it. But I said to myself, if the empress wishes to banish me, let her banish me:—the earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof. If she would saw me in sunder, let her saw me in sunder:—I have *Isaiah* for a pattern. If she would plunge me in the sea:—I remember *Jonah*. If she would thrust me into the fiery furnace:—I see the three children enduring that. If she would cast me to wild beasts:—I call to mind *Daniel* in the den of lions. If she would stone me, let her stone me:—I have before me, *Stephen* the protomartyr. If she would take my head from me, let her take it:—I have *John* the Baptist. If she would deprive me of my worldly goods, let her do it:—naked came I from my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return. An apostle has told me, ‘God respecteth not man’s person;’ and ‘if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of *Christ*.’ And *David* clothes me with armour, saying, ‘I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and will not be ashamed.’”—The works of *Chrysostom*, (including some falsely ascribed to him), consist of about 350 sermons and orations, on a great variety of subjects and occasions; about 620 homilies, or exegetical discourses, on different books of the Old and New Testaments; and about 250 letters; together with several tracts on monasticism, and a treatise on the Priesthood, in six Books. There is also a *Liturgy* which bears his name, being that used at Constantinople, and which perhaps received some alterations from his hand.—For an account of his life and writings, see *Cave*, *Histor. Litteraria*; *Tillemont*, *Memoires—a l’Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xi., p. 1-405, 547-626. *Schroecckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. x., p. 245-490. *Montfaucon*, *Opp. Chrysost.*, tom. xiii., p. 1-177. For the sentiments, character and influence of the man, see *A. Neander’s Johannes Chrysostom. und die Kirche in dessen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1821-22, 2 vols. 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(18) His works, with a Latin translation and notes, were published by the Jesuit, *Dionys. Petavius*, [Paris, 1622, 2 vols. fol., and Cologne (Lips.), 1682]. His life is given in a good sized volume, by *Ja. Gervasius*, Paris, 1738, 4to. [*Epiphannus*, of Jewish extract, was born at *Becanduea*, a village near Eleutheropolis, some twenty miles from Jerusalem, about the year 310. He became a monk in early life, visited Egypt, fell into the toils of the Gnostics,

Gregory of Nyssa, obtained much renown among the theologians and disputants of that age; and their works show, that they were not unworthy to be held in estimation. (19) But after ages would have prized them higher,

escaped, was intimate with *St. Antony*; and returning to Palestine in his 20th year, about 330, became a disciple of *Hilarion*, established a monastery near his native village, called *Ancient Ad*, where he lived more than thirty years. He read much, and was ordained a presbyter over his monastery. In the year 367, he was made archbishop of *Constantia* (formerly *Salamis*) in Cyprus, but still lived by monastic rules.—He engaged in all the controversies of the times, was an active and popular bishop, for 36 years, and regarded as a great saint, and worker of miracles. In 376, he was at Antioch, on the Apollinarian heresy; and in 382, at Rome, on the Meletian controversy. He had a long and fierce contest with *John* bishop of Jerusalem, respecting *Origenism*, which he regarded with strong abhorrence. His friend *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria, having expelled some monks from Egypt, on the charge of *Origenism*, in the year 401, *Epiphanius* held a provincial council of Cyprus, against that error; and as the expelled monks fled to Constantinople, *Epiphanius* followed them in 402, intending to coerce *Chrysostom* into a condemnation of those monks and of *Origenism*. But his enterprise wholly failed, and he died on his way home, A.D. 403, aged above 90 years. He became an author when turned of 60. His first work, *Anchoratus*, (*The Anchor*), was written A.D. 374; to teach the world genuine Christianity, in opposition to the prevailing and especially the Arian heresies. Soon after he composed his great work *contra octoginta Hæreses*, in 3 Books, divided into 7 parts or *tomi*. He also made an Epitome of this work; and wrote a treatise on (scripture) *Weights and Measures*; a Letter to *John* bishop of Jerusalem; another to *Jerome*; and some other works of little value. It is said, he understood five languages, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and Latin. His learning was great, his judgment rash, and his credulity and mistakes very abundant.—See *Care*, *Hist. Literar.*, p. 231–234; and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. x., p. 1–100.—*Tr.*]

(19) Tolerable editions of the writings of both these men, were published in France, during the 17th century; but better editions are anticipated from the Benedictines. [After long delay, the first vol. of the expected Benedictine edition of *Gregory Nazianzen's* works appeared at Paris in 1778, edited by *Clemençet*, large fol. Of the old editions, the best is that of *Billius*, Gr. and Lat.,

Paris, 1609, 1630, and Cologne (Lips.), 1690, 2 vols. fol. His works, as here published, consist of about 50 Orations, or Sermons; near 250 Epistles; and about 140 poems. Besides these, *Muratorì* has published 228 Epigrams and short poems of his; in his *Anecdota Gr.*, p. 1–117, Petav., 1709, 4to. Some of the orations are violent attacks upon Arians and others; many others are eulogies on his friends and on monks; and a few are discourses on practical subjects. Of the poems, one of the longest is an account of his own life. Most of them were written after he retired from public life, and are of a religious character, but of no great merit as specimens of genius. As an orator *Gregory Naz.* is considered superior to *Basil*, for strength and grandeur. He also possessed a fertile imagination. But he has little method, and he abounds in false ornament.—He was born about the year 325. His father, who was also named *Gregory*, was bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia for about 45 years, from A.D. 329 to 374. His mother *Nonna*, like the mother of Samuel, devoted her son to the Lord before he was born. His education was begun at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, continued at Cæsarea in Palestine and at Alexandria, and completed at Athens, at the age of 30, A.D. 355. He was at Athens about five years; and there commenced that intimacy with *Basil* the Great, which lasted through life. On his return to Nazianzus, in 356, he was baptized, and betook himself to a retired and studious life, for which he always manifested a strong predilection. In 361, his father compelled him to receive ordination as a presbyter; and the next year he preached his first sermon. On the death of *Julian*, who had been his fellow-student at Athens, he composed two invectives against him. His friend, archbishop *Basil*, in the year 372, offered him the bishopric of Sasima, which he refused with indignation, on account of his aversion to public life. Yet he afterwards consented to be ordained as assistant to his aged father, on condition of not being obliged to succeed him. Soon after the death of his father, in 374, he retired to Seleucia, and spent three years in obscurity. In 379, being pressed beyond the power of resistance, he went to Constantinople to preach to the remnant of the orthodox there. His success in converting Arians was here very great: and he was so popular, that the general council of Constantinople, and the emperor *Theodosius*, constrained him to accept the patri-

if they had been less attached to Origenism, and more free from the false eloquence of the sophists. Among the Syrians, *Ephraim* has given immortality to his name by the sanctity of his life, and by a great number of writings, in which he confutes heretics, explains the scriptures, and treats on religious duties.(20) Among those of whom but few works have reached us, are, *Pamphylus*, the martyr and intimate friend of Eusebius;(21)

archal chair of that metropolis. But before the council rose, it being objected to him, that it was irregular for a bishop to be transferred from one see to another, he gladly resigned. Returning to Nazianzus, he discharged the episcopal functions there for a short time. But in 383, he retired altogether from public life, and after about seven years spent chiefly in writing religious poetry, he closed life, about A.D. 390. See *Cave*, *Histor. Litteraria*; and *Schroecckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xiii., p. 268-458.

Gregory, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, and younger brother of *Basil* the Great, was probably born about 331, at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Of his early education little is known. He was no monk, and at first averse from the ministry. He was made bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, about the year 372. But soon after he was driven from his see, by the persecution of the Arians, and for several years, travelled from place to place. In 378 he returned to his see. Afterwards, he was much employed on councils, and was greatly esteemed by the orthodox. The council of Antioch, 379, appointed him to visit the churches in Arabia, and restore order there. On his way he visited Jerusalem, and was disgusted with the profligate morals there. In the year 381, he wrote his great work, against *Eunomius* the Arian, in xiii. Books, which procured him great reputation. At the general council of Antioch, in the same year, he is reported to have made the new draught of the Nicene creed, which was afterwards universally adopted by the orthodox. He was also at the council of Constantinople in 394, and probably died not long after. He was a man of considerable acumen, a zealous polemic, and an extravagant orator. His works consist of polemic discourses and treatises, orations, eulogies, letters and homilies; and were published, Gr. and Lat., by *Fronto le Duc*, Paris, 1615, 2 vols. fol., to which *Gretser* added a third vol., Paris, 1618. The 3 vols were reprinted, but less correctly, Paris, 1638, fol. A better edition has long been desired. See *Cave*, *Histor. Litter.*, and *Schroecckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xiv., p. 3-147.—*Tr.*]

(20) An elaborate account is given of him, by *Jos. Simon Asseman*, in his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i., p. 24, &c. The

English published several of his works, in Greek, at Oxford [by *Edw. Thwaites*, 1709, fol.] The same were published in a Latin translation by *Gerh. Vossius*, [Rome, 1589-97, 3 vols. fol.] His works were published in Syriac, a few years since, at Rome, by *Steph. Euod. Asseman*. [Six volumes in all; vol. i., ii., iii., Gr. and Lat., 1732-43-46; vol. iv., v., vi., Syriac and Lat., 1737-40-43, fol.—*Ephraim* Syrus, a monk and deacon of the church at Nisibis in northern Syria, was born and spent his whole life in and near that city. When elected bishop there, he feigned himself deranged and absconded, to avoid promotion. He was a most ardent devotee of monkery, a man of genius, and a prolific writer. His works consist of essays and sermons, chiefly on the monastic and moral virtues, commentaries on nearly the whole Bible, and hymns and prayers. A few of his essays are polemic. All his works were written in Syriac, and were so popular in Syria as to be read in public after the Scriptures, and being early translated into Greek, were held in high estimation in that age. It is said, his hymns and prayers are still used in the Syriac churches. He died A.D. 378. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 115. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., l. iii., c. 16. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., ii., c. 30, and iv., 29. *Schroecckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. viii., 255, &c., and xv., 527, &c. *Milner's Church History*, cent. iv., ch. 21.—*Tr.*]

(21) [*Pamphylus*, a presbyter of Cæsarea in Palestine, was born at Berytus, studied under *Pierius* of Alexandria, and spent his life at Cæsarea. He was a learned, benevolent, and devout man, and a great promoter of theological learning. He procured an extensive theological library, which he gave to the church of Cæsarea. Most of the works of *Origen*, he transcribed with his own hand, and particularly the corrected copy of the Septuagint in *Origen's Hexapla*. One of these transcripts, *P. D. Huet* states, is still in possession of the Jesuits of Clermont. He wrote a vindication and biography of *Origen*, in 5 Books, to which *Eusebius* added a sixth Book. The whole are lost, except a Latin translation of Book first, made by *Rufinus*. During the persecution he was imprisoned two years, and then put to death. *Eusebius*, his great admirer, wrote his life

Diodorus of Tarsus; (22) *Hosius* of Corduba; (23) *Eustathius* of Antioch; (24) *Didymus* of Alexandria; (25) *Amphilochius* of Iconium; (26) *Pal-*

in iii. Books, which are lost. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 77. *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 32. *Cave*, Historia Litterar.—Tr.]

(22) [*Diodorus*, or *Theodorus*, bishop of *Tarsus*, was head of a monastic school and a presbyter at Antioch, where he had *Chrysostom* for a pupil. He became bishop of Tarsus in 378, sat in the general council at Constantinople 381, and was succeeded at Tarsus by *Phalerius* A.D. 394. He was a learned man, and a voluminous, though not an elegant, writer. His works were chiefly scientific and controversial, in opposition to errorists and unbelievers, and explanatory of the Scriptures, which he construed literally. None of his works remain entire; but abstracts and numerous extracts are preserved by *Photius* and others. See *Suidas*, voce Διόδωρος. *Socrates*, H. E., vi., 3. *Sozomen*, H. E., viii., 2. *Theodoret*, H. E., iv., 25. *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 119. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. viii., p. 358, &c. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles., tome viii., p. 558, &c., 802, &c. *Schroëckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. x., p. 247–251.—Tr.]

(23) [*Hosius*, bishop of *Corduba* in Spain, was born about the middle of the preceding century, became a bishop before the end of it, and sat in the council of Illiberis, A.D. 305. He was chief counsellor, in ecclesiastical affairs, to *Constantine* the Great; who summoned him to the council of Arles in 314, and sent him to Egypt, to settle the religious disputes of that country in 324. He stood at the head of the council of Nice in 325; and presided in that of Sardica in 347. By the Arian Council of Sirmium 356, he was banished, when near a hundred years old; and unable to resist, he now signed an artfully-drawn Arian creed; and died A.D. 361, having lived more than 100 years, and been a bishop during about 70. Nothing written by him remains, except an epistle to the emperor *Constantius*, preserved by *Athanasius*, in his Historia Arianor. ad Monachos. See *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles., tome vii., p. 300–321, and *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. viii., p. 399.—Tr.]

(24) [*Eustathius*, a native of Side in Pamphylia, was bishop of Beaea (now Aleppo) in Syria, and promoted to the patriarchate of Antioch by the council of Nice, A.D. 325. He had previously distinguished himself as an opposer of Arianism; and in that council, he acted a conspicuous part. This,

together with his *libri* viii. contra *Arianos*, rendered him extremely obnoxious to the abettors of Arianism, who procured his condemnation in one of their councils, about the year 330. *Eustathius* appealed in vain to the emperor, *Constantine* the Great: he was banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace, where he died about the year 360. His only entire works now extant, are his treatise on the Witch of Endor, in opposition to *Origen*, and a short address to the emperor, delivered at the council of Nice. These, together with a treatise on the Hexæmeron, which is ascribed to him, were published by *Leo Allatius*, Lyons, 1629, 4to. What remains of his viii. Books against the Arians, was published by *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. viii., p. 170, &c. He was highly esteemed by the orthodox of his times. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 85. *Chrysostom*, Laudatio Eustathii, Opp. Chrysost., tom. ii., p. 603. *Athanasius*, Epist. ad Solitarios. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar. *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles., vol. iii. *Fabricius*, ubi supra, p. 166, &c., and *Schroëckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. v., p. 275, &c.—Tr.]

(25) [*Didymus*, a learned monk of Alexandria, and head of the catechetical school there, was the preceptor of *Jerome* and *Rufinus*. He lost his eyesight when young, yet became very conspicuous as a scholar and a theologian. He was born before the year 311, and was alive A.D. 392, then more than 83 years old. Of his numerous works, only three have reached us; namely, de Spiritu Sancto Liber, preserved in a Latin translation of *Jerome*, (inter Opp. Hieronymi, tom. iv., pt. i., p. 493, &c.), Scholia on the canonical Epistles, also in a Latin translation. Both these are given in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. v., p. 320, 338. Liber adversus Manichæos; Gr. and Lat., in *Combes*, Auctarium noviss. Biblioth. Patr., pt. ii., p. 21, &c. Besides these, he wrote commentaries on the greater part of the Bible; and, de Trinitate lib. iii.; contra *Arianos* libri ii.; and a comment on the four Books of *Origen* de Principiis, in defence of *Origen's* sentiments. See *Jerome*, de Scriptor. Illustr., c. 109; and *Cave*, Historia Litteraria.—Tr.]

(26) [*Amphilochius*, after being a civil magistrate, and living a while with *Basil* and *Gregory* Naz. in their monastery, was made bishop of Iconium in Lycia, about the year 370 or 375. He sat in the second gen. council at Constantinople, A.D. 381; and in the same year, was appointed by the emperor *Theodosius*, inspector of the clergy

ladius, author of the *Lausiaca History*; (27) *Macarius*, senior and junior; (28)

in the diocese of Asia. Two years after, wishing to persuade the emperor to enact severer laws against the Arians, he appeared in his presence, without showing respect to his son, the young *Arcadius*. At this the emperor was indignant. The bishop replied: "Sire, are you offended because indignity is offered to *your* son? Then, be assured, God must abhor those who treat *his* Son with disrespect." The argument was irresistible; and the emperor granted his request. He probably died A.D. 395. Ten short pieces, chiefly orations, and various fragments, were published as his works, (though most of them are of dubious origin), by *Combesis*, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1644, fol., including the works of *Methodius* Patarens. and *Andreas* Cretensis. A few other tracts are extant under his name; and a considerable number mentioned by the ancients, cannot now be found. See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. vii., p. 500–507. *Oudin*, Commentar. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast., tom. ii., p. 216, &c. *Cave*, Histor. Litterar., and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. xii., p. 67–70.—*Tr.*]

(27) [*Palladius* of Galatia, born A.D. 368, at the age of 20 went to Egypt, to get a practical knowledge of monkery. After residing among the monks of Egypt several years, his health failed, and he returned to Palestine, still leading a monastic life. In the year 400, going to Bithynia, *Chrysostom* ordained him bp. of Hellenopolis, which he afterwards exchanged for Aspona in Galatia. After the fall of *Chrysostom* in 404, *Palladius* was banished, and died in exile about A.D. 431. His great work was composed about the year 420, and contains the history of the principal monks of his own times, with many of whom he was personally acquainted. Being written at the request of *Lausus*, the emperor's lord of the bedchamber, it was called *Historia Lausiaca*. It is the honest statement of a credulous monk, who almost adored the heroes of his story. Several Latin editions have been published. In Greek it appeared, Lugd. Bat., 1616, 4to; and Gr. and Lat. in the Auctar. Biblioth. Patr., Paris, 1624, tom. ii., p. 893–1053, fol., and in Biblioth. Patr., Paris, 1624, tom. xiii.—The other works ascribed to him are, *Dialogi de Vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi*, inter *Palladium* Ep. Hellenopolitanum et Theodorum ecclesiæ Romanæ diaconum, (extat inter *Opp. Chrysost.*), and *de gentibus Indiae et Brachmanibus Liber*.—See *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. ix., p. 2, &c. *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs, &c. *Cave*, *Historia Litterar. Tilllemont*, *Mémoires*—à l'Hist. Eccles., vol. i., p. 500, &c.—*Tr.*]

(28) [*Macarius* senior, or the Great, called the *Egyptian Macarius*, a native of Thebais, was born A.D. 302, early addicted himself to a monastic life, at the age of thirty retired to the wilderness of *Scetis* and the mountains, *Nitria*, where he lived a hermit for 60 years. He became a presbyter at the age of 40, and died at the age of 90, A.D. 391. Much is related of his austerities, his virtues, his wisdom, and his miracles. To him are ascribed, and it is probable correctly, seven opuscula and fifty homilies or discourses; all upon practical and experimental religion; edited, last, by *J. G. Pritius*, Gr. and Lat., Lips., 1714, 2 vols. in one, 12mo, p. 285 and 566.—*Macarius* junior, called the *Alexandrian Macarius*, because he was born and spent the first part of his life at Alexandria, was contemporary with *Macarius* senior, with whom he is often confounded. He was born about A.D. 304, pursued traffic some years, became a monk, retired to the wilderness of *Scetis*, was baptized at 40, became a presbyter, headed a numerous band of monks in the mountains of Nitria, and died about A.D. 404, aged 100 years. He was no less distinguished for his virtues and his miracles, than the other *Macarius*. Both copied after *St. Antonius*, both were hermits, inhabited the same region of country, and lived at the same time. But the senior *Macarius* was unsocial, especially with strangers; whereas the younger was very affable, and often visited the city Alexandria; whence he was called *πολιτικός*, the *citizen*. The younger wrote nothing, but a single letter to his disciples. The code of 30 monastic rules, ascribed to him, was probably the production of a later age. Both are mentioned by most of the contemporary writers, as *Jerome*, *Rufinus*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and especially *Palladius*, (*Lausiaca History*, c. 19, 20), who was a disciple of the younger *Macarius*. But their history is little more than an account of their rules of life, their conversations, their miraculous deeds, the admiration in which they were held, and the crowds of visitors and disciples which attended them. See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 23. *Palladius*, Hist. Lausiaca, c. 19, 20. *Rufinus*, Vitæ Patrum, c. 28. *Cassianus* de Coenobior. Institut., l. v., c. 41, and Collat., v., c. 12, xv., c. 3, xxiv., c. 13. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., l. iii., c. 14, l. vi., c. 29. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 21. *Tilllemont*, *Mémoires*—à l'Hist. Eccles., tom. viii., p. 243, 264, 257. *Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. vii., p. 491, &c. *Cave*, *Histor. Litterar.*—*Tr.*]

Apollinaris, senior;(29) and a few others,(30) are most frequently mentioned on account of their learning and their achievements.

(29) [*Apollinaris*, or *Apollinarius*, senior, was born at Alexandria, taught grammar at *Berytus*, and at *Laodicea* in Syria, where he became a presbyter. He associated with *Epiphanius* the sophist, a pagan, and attended his lectures; for which, both he and his son, the younger *Apollinaris*, were excommunicated. But repenting, they were restored. In the year 362, when the emperor *Julian* prohibited the Christians from reading the classic poets and orators, *Apollinaris* and his son undertook to compose some sacred classics, to take the place of the pagan. The father took up the Old Testament, and transferred the Pentateuch into heroic verse, in imitation of *Homer*; and also, according to *Sozomen*, he formed the rest of the Old T. history into Comedies, Tragedies, Lyrics, &c., in imitation of *Mæander*, *Euripides*, and *Pindar*. The son laboured on the New Test., and transferred the Gospels and the canonical Epistles into Dialogues, in imitation of those of *Plato*. Nearly all, if not the whole, of these sacred classics, are lost. Yet there is extant a poetic Gr. version of the Psalms, bearing the name of *Apollinaris*. The Tragedy of *Christ suffering*, published among the works of *Gregory Naz.*, is also by some ascribed to the elder *Apollinaris*.—The younger *Apollinaris*, wrote likewise, adversus Porphyrium Libri 30; de Veritate, adv. Julianum et philosophos; contra Eunomii apologiam Liber: Commentarii breves in Isaiam; Hymni et Cantica sacra; de Incarnatione Libellus; de Fide Libellus; and several Epistles, of which two perliaps are extant. Of all the rest of his works, only fragments remain.—The younger *Apollinaris* believed, that the divine nature in *Christ* did the office of a rational human soul; so that God the Word, with a sensitive soul (*ψυχή*) and a body, constituted the person of the Saviour. For this, he was accounted a heretic, and condemned by public councils. He died between A.D. 380 and 392.—Both were learned and excellent men, and strenuous opposers of the Arian creed. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 104. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl., ii., 46, and iii., 16. *Sozomen*, H. E., v., 18, and vi., 25. *Philostorg.*, H. E., viii., 11–15. *Fabreius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. vii., p. 659, &c., viii., p. 332. *Tillemont*, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccl., vol. vii. *Cave*, Hist. Litteraria.—*Tr.*]

(30) [Less distinguished than the foregoing, were, in the eastern or Greek church, the pseudo-*Dorotheus*, a fabled bishop of Tyre, who was a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, and a martyr under *Julian*, aged

more than 100 years. To him is attributed the Epitome of the Lives of the Prophets, Apostles, and the 70 Disciples of Christ; extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. iii., p. 421. See *Cave*, Historia Litterar.

Alexander, bishop of *Alexandria*, A.D. 312–325, famous as beginning the controversy with *Arius*, who was his presbyter. Of more than 70 epistles, written by him on the Arian controversy, only two are extant; preserved, one by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccl., i. i., c. 4, and the other by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl., i. i., c. 6.

Constantine the Great, emperor A.D. 306–337. He wrote many epistles and some orations, which his secretaries translated into Greek. Of these, 24 epistles and two orations are preserved, by *Eusebius* and others, and among the Acts of councils. Many of his edicts are also preserved in the Codex Theodosianus.

Eusebius, bishop of *Nicomedia*, and afterwards court bishop of *Constantinople*, and the stanch patron of *Arius*. He was condemned in the council of Nice, and banished by the emperor; retracted and was restored; became the great supporter of Arianism; and died A.D. 342. A single epistle of his, has been preserved by *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccl., i. i., c. 6.

James, bishop of *Nisibis* in Syria; a confessor in the Diocletian persecution, an assessor in the Nicene council, and died in the reign of *Constantinus*. He probably wrote wholly in Syriac; but his works were first published, Armenian and Latin, by *N. Antonelli*, Rome, 1756, fol., containing 19 essays and discourses, chiefly on moral and practical subjects.

St. Antonius, a renowned Egyptian monk, who flourished about A.D. 330. His life, written by *Athanasius*, is still extant; likewise, his monastic rules, his remarks on cases of conscience, and about 20 Discourses. These opuscula were published, in a Latin translation from Arabic, Rome, 1646, 8vo.

Asterius of Cappadocia, a fickle and ambitious man, in the period next following the Nicene council, and a zealous Arian. He was never admitted to the clerical office, possessed some talent, and wrote comments on the Scriptures, and tracts in favour of Arianism; of which, only fragments remain.

Marcellus, bishop of *Ancyra* in Galatia. He held a council at Ancyra in 315, and was conspicuous in the orthodox ranks at the council of Nice. Afterwards his zeal against Arianism, carried him into *Sabellianism*. He was condemned and deposed in 333, acquit-

§ 10. Among the Latin writers, the following are most worthy of notice. *Hilary*, bishop of *Poitiers*, famous for his twelve Books *on the*

ted in 347, but still regarded with suspicion. He died A.D. 370. Many wrote against him; and he wrote much, but nothing but what time has consumed.

Theodorus, bishop of *Heraclea* in Thrace A.D. 334–344, a Semarian, and a zealous opposer of *Athanasius*. He died about the year 358. His commentaries on various parts of the Bible, are highly commended by *Jerome* and others, for their style and erudition. All are lost, except his commentary on the Psalms, which is prefixed to the *Catenæ Veterum Patrum in Psalmos*, ed. Antwerp, 1643, 3 vols. fol.

Acacius, bishop of *Cæsarea* in Palestine A.D. 340–366, successor to *Eusebius*, whose secretary he had been; a man of learning and eloquence, but unstable, and fluctuating between Arianism and orthodoxy. He wrote much, particularly in explanation of the Scriptures; but nothing that has been preserved.

Triphylus of *Ledris* in Cyprus, flourished A.D. 340. He was bred to the bar, and was considered one of the most elegant writers of his age. He wrote on the Canticles, and the life of *Spiridon*, his bishop; but nothing of his remains.

Eusebius, bishop of *Emessa* in Phenicia, was born at Edessa, studied there, and at Alexandria in Egypt, and Antioch in Syria. As early as 312, he was distinguished for scholarship and for unassuming modesty. He refused the bishopric of Alexandria in 341; but soon after accepted that of *Emessa*, and died about A.D. 360. He leaned towards Semiarianism; wrote much and elegantly, on the scriptures, and against the Jews. What has been published as his, has been much questioned.

George, bishop of *Laodicea*, a staunch Arian, and active in all their measures, from A.D. 335 to 360. He wrote against the Manichæans; the life of *Eusebius* of *Emessa*; and several epistles, one of which is preserved by *Sozomen*, H. Eccl., l. iv., c. 13.

Pachomius, (died 350), *Theodorus*, his successor, and *Oresiesis*, were distinguished contemporary monks of *Tabennesis* in Thebais, Egypt. They flourished from A.D. 340–350. Monastic rules, some epistles, and several discourses, are extant under the names of one or more of them.

Serapion, a monk of Thebais, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the friend of *Athanasius*, who made him bishop of *Thmuis*. He died about A.D. 358. Of his once popular writings, only his *Liber contra Manichæos* is extant; Latin, in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. iv., p. 160.

Basil, bishop of *Ancyra*, from 336 to 360, was a Semarian, highly esteemed by *Constantius*, and very active against the orthodox. Contention between him and *Acacius*, preceded his deposition and banishment to Illyricum in the year 360. He wrote much, and in particular, against *Marcellus* his predecessor; but none of his works are extant.

Leontius, the Arian bishop of *Antioch*, A.D. 348–358, a crafty and deceptive man, who was active in the contentions of his times. Of his writings, only a fragment of one discourse remains.

Marcus, an Egyptian bishop, and a friend of *Athanasius*, banished in 356 by *George* bishop of Alexandria. He wrote an oration against the Arians, which is published with *Origen's* tract on the Lord's prayer, by *Welstein*, Amsterdam, 1695, 4to.

Aëtius of Syria, a goldsmith, physician, deacon at Antioch, bishop somewhere, and finally a heretic. He held *Christ* to be a mere creature. He died about the year 366. His book *de Fide*, in 47 chapters, is transcribed and refuted, in *Epiphanius*, Haer. 76.

Eudoxius, bishop of *Germanicia* on the Euphrates, and (356) of *Antioch*, and (360) of *Constantinople*; died A.D. 370. He was successively an Arian, a Semarian, and an *Aëtian*; a learned, but a verbose and obscure writer. Large fragments of his discourse *de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, are extant.

Eunomius, the secretary and disciple of *Aëtius*, but more famous than his master. He was made bishop of *Cyzicum* A.D. 360, banished soon after, wandered much, and died about A.D. 394. He wrote on the epistle to the Romans; many letters; his own creed, and an Apology for it. Only the two last are extant. He held *Christ* to be a created being, and of a nature unlike to that of God.

Meletius, bishop of *Sebaste* in Armenia, and (360) of *Antioch*. He was banished A.D. 361, returned under *Julian*; was banished again under *Valens*, and restored by *Gratian*, and died while attending the general council of Constantinople A.D. 381, at an advanced age. There is extant, (in *Epiphanius*, Haeres. 73, c. 29–34), an able discourse, which he delivered at Antioch in 361, when, holding up three fingers, and then closing two of them, he said: "We conceive there are three persons, but we address them as one."

Titus, bishop of *Bostra* in Arabia, was driven from his see, under *Julian*, A.D. 362; returned under *Valentinian*; and died about

Trinity, and for other writings. He possessed a considerable degree of perspicacity and ingenuity; but he was often disposed to borrow from *Tertullian* and *Origen*, whom he greatly admired, rather than to tax his own genius. (31) *Lactantius*, the most eloquent of the Latin Christians in

the year 371. He wrote *contra Manichæos libri iii.*, which are extant in a Latin translation, in *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. iv. A discourse likewise, on the branches of palm, Gr. and Lat., and a commentary on Luke, in Latin, have been published under his name, but are questioned.

Paphnutius, a celebrated Egyptian monk, who flourished A.D. 370. He wrote the life of *St. Onyphrius*, and of several other monks; still extant.

Cæsarius, younger brother of *Gregory Nazianzenus*, was a learned physician of Constantinople, and was elevated to civil office. He is said to have written several works, and particularly a treatise against the pagans. There are extant under his name, iv. Dialogues, Gr. and Lat., on 195 questions in theology; in *Fronto le Duc's* *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.*, 1624, tom. i. But they are supposed not to be his, as they show the hand of a well-read theologian.

Evagrius, archdeacon of Constantinople in 381, and after 385, an Egyptian monk. He was a pious and learned man, and a considerable writer. Several of his devotional and practical works are extant, in the different collections of the works of the fathers.

Nemesius, bishop of *Emessa*, after being a Christian philosopher. He flourished A.D. 380, and with *Origen*, held to the pre-existence of human souls; as appears from his book, *de Natura Hominis*, extant in the *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.*, 1624, tom. ii., also printed Gr. and Lat., Oxford, 1671, 8vo.

Nectarius, bishop of *Constantinople* A.D. 381–398, orthodox and pious. One of his discourses is extant, inter Opp. *Chrysostomi*, who was his successor.

Flavianus, a monk, and bishop of *Antioch* A.D. 381–403. He first divided the choir, and taught them to sing the Psalms of David responsively. He was strenuous against the Arians; but fragments only of his discourses and letters remain.

Theophilus, bishop of *Alexandria* A.D. 385–412, was famous for his contention with the Nitric monks, and for his opposition to Origenism. Of his works only a few epistles, and considerable extracts from his other writings, are extant.

John, bishop of *Jerusalem* A.D. 386–416, famous for his contests with *Epiphanius* and with *Jerome*, respecting *Origen's* character. Numerous works, perhaps without foundation, are published as his. They consist of commentaries on scripture and hom-

ilies. The homilies are printed among the works of *Chrysostom*: and the whole are published as his works, Brussels, 1643, 2 vols. fol.

Hieronymus of Dalmatia, a presbyter, and monk, who flourished A.D. 386. He is author of Lives of the Egyptian monks; the original Greek, though preserved, has not been published; because the *Lausiac History* of *Palladius* is nearly a literal translation of it.

Sophronius, the friend of *Jerome*, and translator into Greek of some of his works, particularly of his book, *de Viris Illustribus*. He flourished about A.D. 390; and was, as *Jerome* says, *apprime eruditus*; yet he is little noticed by other contemporary writers. —Tr.]

(31) Concerning *Hilary*, the Benedictine monks have given an accurate account, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tome ii., [tome i., partie ii.] p. 139–193, [à Paris, 1733, 4to.] The best edition of his works, is that of the French Benedictines, [by *Coutant*, Paris, 1693, fol., revised and improved by *Scip. Maffei*, Verona, 1730, 2 vols. fol.]

—*Hilary* of *Poitiers* in France, was a native of Gaul, of respectable parentage, and well educated. He was a pagan, till he had attained to manhood. His consecration to the episcopal office, was about the year 350. For 20 years he stood pre-eminent among the Gallic bishops, and did much to arrest the progress of Arianism in the West. In the council of *Besiers*, A.D. 356, he handled the Arian bishops, (*Saturninus*, *Ursacius*, *Valens*, and others), so roughly, that they applied to the emperor *Constantius*, and had him banished to Phrygia. During the four years he was an exile in Asia, he wrote most of his works, and was so active in opposing Arianism there, that the heretical clergy, to get rid of him, procured his release from banishment. He returned to his church, a more able and more successful antagonist to the Gallic Arians than he was before. He was the principal means of rolling back the Arian current, which was sweeping over the West.—His great work is his *de Trinitate* Libri xii. He also wrote three different tracts addressed to the emperor; an account of the synods held in the East against the Arians; concerning the councils of *Arimini* and *Seleucia*, and the events that followed to the year 366; Commentaries on Matthew, and on the Psalms. Besides these, he wrote several works which

this century, assailed the superstition of the pagans, in his pure and elegantly written *Divine Institutions*; and likewise wrote on other subjects. But he is more successful in confuting the errors of others, than in correcting his own. (32) *Ambrose*, first a governor, and then bishop of *Milan*, is not rude in diction or conception, nor is he destitute of valuable thoughts; yet he is chargeable with the faults of the age, a deficiency in solidity, accuracy, and good arrangement. (33) *Hieronymus*, a monk of Palestine, has

are lost, such as commentaries, hymns, epistles, &c.—See *Jerome*, de *Viris Illustr.*, c. 109. *Fortunatus*, de *Vita Hilarii*, Libri ii. (prefixed to the *Opp. Hilarii* ed. Bened.) *Coutant*, Life of *Hilary*, prefixed to the Benedictine edition of his works *Tillemont*, *Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles.*, tome vii., p. 442, &c., 745, &c., and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xii., p. 253–342.—*Hilary* was learned, but his style is exceedingly swollen and obscure.—*Tr.*]

(32) Of *Lactantius* also the Benedictines have given an account, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 65, &c. His works have been through numerous editions; the latest and best are by the celebrated *Bunemann*, [Lips., 1739, 8vo], the venerable *Heumann*, [Gotting., 1736, 8vo], and *Lenglet du Frenoy*, [Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to, and Zweybr., 1786, 2 vols. 8vo.—*Lucius Cæcilius Lactantius Firmilianus* was probably a native of Italy; studied under *Arnobius* in Africa; removed to Nicomedia in the reign of *Diocletian*, and opened a school for rhetoric, in which he had but few pupils. He was made private tutor or governor to *Crispus*, the oldest son of *Constantine* the Great, when an old man; and probably died a little before A.D. 330. He was learned, though not a profound theologian, and the most elegant of all the Latin fathers. Some think him the best writer of Latin, after the days of *Cicero*.—His works still extant, are, *Divinarum Institutionum libri vii*, written about the year 320. This is his great work. It may be called a Guide to true Religion; being designed to enlighten the pagans, and convert them to Christianity. *Institutionum Epitome*; or an abridgment of the preceding. It is imperfect, extending over the three last books only. *De Ira Dei*; and *de Opificio Dei*, or on the works of creation, particularly on the physical structure and powers of man. These two works are, properly, a continuation of the first; being written in furtherance of the same designs. *De Mortibus Persecutorum*; an account of persecutors and persecutions, from *Nero* to *Maxentius*, A.D. 312. Some have questioned its genuineness. An English translation of this valuable treatise, with a long preface, was published by *Gilb. Burnet*, 1637, 18mo. *Symposium*; a juvenile per-

formance, extant as the work of a fabled *Symposius*. The *Carmen de Phœnice*, is perhaps his. His lost works are, *Grammaticus*; *ὁδοιπορικόν*, a poetic account of his voyage to Nicomedia; ad *Asclepiadem* libri ii.; ad *Probum* *Epistolarum* libri iv.; ad *Severum* *Epistolarum* libri ii.; ad *Demetrium* *Epistolarum* libri ii.—See *Jerome*, de *Viris Illustr.*, c. 80. *Cave*, *Historia Literar.* *Lardner*, *Credibility*, &c., vol. vii. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. v., p. 220–262.—*Tr.*]

(33) The Benedictine monks of France, published his works in 2 large folio volumes, [1686–1690.—*Ambrose* was the son of a prætorian prefect of the same name, who was governor general of Gaul, Britain, and Spain. After a good education for civil life, he became an advocate, counsellor to *Probus* his father's successor, and at last governor of Liguria and Aemylia, resident at Milan. In the year 374, *Auxentius*, bp. of Milan, died; and the Arians and orthodox became tumultuous in the church, when met to elect a successor. *Ambrose* entered the church to quell the riot, and a little child happening to say “*Ambrose, bishop*,” the mob presently cried out, “let him be the bishop.”—He was constrained to submit; gave up all his property, and his worldly honours, was baptized, and became a laborious and self-denying bishop. An irruption of barbarians in 377, obliged him to flee; and he went to Illyricum, and thence to Rome. In the year 381, he presided in the council of Aquileia. In 383, the emperor *Valentinian* sent him as ambassador to *Maximus* the usurper in Gaul. Next came his contest with *Symmachus*, prefect of Rome, respecting the rebuilding the pagan altar of Victory in that city. In 386, he had much contention with the Arians of Milan. Afterwards he was sent on a second embassy to *Maximus*. Three years after, he debarred the emperor *Theodosius* the Great from Christian ordinances, and required him to do penance, for the slaughter of the citizens of Thessalonica by his order. In 392, civil war obliged him to leave Milan for a time. He soon returned, but died A.D. 397, aged 64 years. He was devout, energetic, orthodox, and a very useful bishop. His knowledge of theology was not great; but he was able to read the Greek fathers, and

undoubtedly merited the esteem of the Christian world, by various of his productions; but at the same time, his bitterness towards those who differed from him, his eagerness after fame, his choleric and ungovernable temper, his unjust aspersions on good and innocent persons, his extravagant commendation of superstition and false piety, and other defects of character, have disgraced him not a little, in the view of those who are neither uncandid nor incompetent judges. Among his various writings, those which interpret the holy scriptures, and his *epistles*, are the most valuable. (34) *Augustine*, bishop of *Hippo* in Africa, is one whose fame

he knew the world. His writings were numerous. On the Scriptures he wrote much, but nothing that is valuable. He wrote several treatises and discourses on monkeny; de Officiis, libri iii.; de Mysteriis Liber; de Sacramentis, libri v., which are greatly corrupted, if not altogether supposititious; de Pœnitentia, libri ii., also de Fide, or de Trinitate, libri v.; and de Spiritu Sancto, libri iii.; the two last were in great measure compilations from Greek fathers, and were addressed to the emperor *Gratian*. Several discourses and eulogies, and about 90 epistles of his production are extant; besides a great number of short sermons, scholia on the canonical epistles, and tracts of different kinds, which are falsely ascribed to him.—His life, written by *Paulinus* his private secretary, is stuffed with accounts of miracles and wonders, performed by him. See Opp. Ambrosii, tom. ii., Appendix, ed. Benedict. *Care*, Historia Litterar. Tillemont, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles., tom. x., p. 78–306, 729. &c. *G. Hermant*, Vie de S. Ambroise, à Paris, 1673, 4to. *Schroëckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. xiv., p. 148–332, and *Jos. Milner*, Church History, cent. iv., ch. 12–16, 18.—*Tr.*]

(34) The defects of *Jerome*, are learnedly exposed by *Jo. le Clerc*, in his *Quæstiones Hieronymianæ*, Amstelod., 1700, 12mo. His works have been published by the Benedictines, ed. *Martianay*. [Paris, 1693–1706], in five volumes folio. This edition was republished, with considerable additions [and improvements in the arrangement, the prefaces, and the explanatory notes], by *Vallarsius*, Verona, [1734–43, xi. vols. fol.—*Hieronymus Stridonensis*, or *Jerome* of *Stridon* in *Dalmatia*, was born of Christian parents, about the year 331. His father, *Eusebius*, gave him the best advantages for education. He was early sent to Rome, where he studied many years, and under the best masters. About the year 363, he was baptized, and left Rome to travel for improvement in knowledge. He journeyed through Gaul, and resided a few years at *Trèves*, where he became a monk, and devoured many books. On his return he spent some time at *Aquileia*, where he formed a close friendship with

Rufinus. In 373 he left *Aquileia*, and embarked for Syria, in company with several friends, and carrying his own large collection of books. Landing in Thrace, he passed the Bosphorus, and travelled over land to *Antioch*. Here his friend *Innocentius* died, and he himself was dangerously sick. After recovering, he was induced by a dream to renounce for ever the reading of the pagan classics. From *Apollinaris* the younger, he obtained farther instruction in biblical interpretation. In 374, he retired into the wilderness eastward of Antioch; and supported by his friends, he there spent about four years in the character of a learned *hermit* and author, yet held correspondence with the world, and took part in the passing religious controversies. In 378 or 379, he returned to *Antioch*, and was ordained a presbyter. The next year he visited *Constantinople*, to enjoy the instructions of *Gregory Nazianzen*. Here he continued two or three years, formed a better acquaintance with the Greek fathers, and translated some of their works, in particular, *Eusebius'* Chronicon, which he continued down to A.D. 378, and *Origen's* Homilies on *Jeremiah*. In 382, he accompanied *Paulinus* and *Epiphanius* to Rome, respecting the contests in the church of Antioch. *Damasus*, bishop of Rome, was much pleased with him, employed him occasionally as a private secretary, and prompted him to write on several biblical subjects, and at length, to undertake a correction of the vulgar Latin Bible. *Jerome* likewise did much to promote monkeny in Italy. But the ardour he kindled up, on this subject, among the Roman ladies, created him enemies among the other sex. He also gave offence to the clergy of Rome, and thought it best to leave Italy in 385, and return to the East, with *Paula* and *Eustochium* her daughter, wealthy Roman ladies, whom he had rendered enthusiastic in regard to monastic institutions. He first went to Antioch, and thence to *Jerusalem*, where he and his ladies performed a winter's pilgrimage. In the spring of 386, they went to Alexandria, and thence to visit the Nitric monks. Returning the same year to Palestine, they took up their permanent residence at *Bethlehem*.

is spread throughout the Christian world. And he certainly possessed many and great excellences, a superior genius, a constant love and pursuit of truth, admirable patience of labour, unquestionable piety, and acuteness and discrimination by no means contemptible. But his power of judging was not equally great; and often the natural ardour of his mind carried this excellent man farther, than his reason and distinct comprehension could go. He has therefore afforded to many, much ground for controversy respecting his real sentiments, and to others, occasion to tax him with inconsistency, and with hastily throwing upon paper thoughts, which he had not himself duly considered. (35) *Optatus of Milevi*, an African, has

Here *Paula* erected four monasteries, three for nuns, and one for monks. In this last, *Jerome* passed the remainder of his days, in reading, composing books, and contending with all who presumed to differ from him, on any subject in which he took interest. He is said to have died on the 30th of September, A.D. 420, aged 90 years.—*Jerome* was the best informed of all the Latin fathers, in sacred literature. The Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, were all familiar to him; and he had a very extensive acquaintance with the best writers of both the Latin and the Greek churches. He likewise possessed genius, industry, and literary enterprise, in no ordinary degree. He was also acute and discriminating; but his vivid imagination, and his choleric temper which scorned all restraint, rendered him one of the most caustic and abusive controversial writers that ever pretended to be a Christian. When he has no antagonist, and sees no enemy, he is a charming writer; yet enthusiastic, and often hasty and injudicious. The greater part of his works, and particularly his translations and commentaries on the Bible, were written while he resided at Bethlehem. As given to us in the Benedictine edition, in five volumes; vol. i. contains his translations of the whole Bible; namely, the canonical books of the O. T. from the Hebrew; also, Job, Psalms, Tobit, and Esther, translated from the Greek; and the whole N. T., with copious notes, from the Greek. Vol. ii. contains some glossaries, and numerous tracts and letters on a variety of subjects in sacred literature. Vol. iii. contains his commentaries on all the prophets. Vol. iv. contains his commentary on Matthew, and on the Epp. to the Gal., Ephes., Titus and Philemon; and about 120 letters and essays, narrative, polemic, apologetic, &c. The vth. vol. contains only works falsely ascribed to *Jerome*. See *Care*, *Historia Litterar. Tillemont, Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles.*, tom. xii., p. 1–356. *Martianay*, *Vie de St. Jérôme*, Paris, 1706, 4to. *J. Stilling*, *Acta Sanctor. Septembris*, tom. viii., p. 418–688, Antw., 1762, fol. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchen-*

gesch., vol. xi., p. 3–239. *J. Milner*, *Church Hist.*, cent. iv., ch. 10.—*Tr.*]

(35) After the edition by the theologians of *Louvaine*, [Antwerp, 1577, x. vols. fol.], the Benedictine monks gave a neat and accurate edition of *Augustine's* work; [Paris, 1679–1700, xi. vols. fol.] This was reprinted with enlargements, in Holland, or, as the title says, at *Antwerp*, under the eye of *Jo. le Clerc*, with the assumed name of *Jo. Phe-reponus*, [1700–1703, xii. vols. fol., printed at *Amsterdam*. It was also reprinted at *Venice*, 1729–1735.] But the Jesuits censure many things in the Benedictine edition. [They think the editors leaned too much towards the *Jansenists*, between whom and the Jesuits there was a long and violent controversy respecting the sentiments of *Augustine*.—*Aurelius Augustinus* was born Nov. 13, A.D. 354, at Tagaste, an obscure village in Numidia. His father *Patricius*, was a pagan till near the close of life. His mother, *Monia*, was eminently pious. He had a good school education in grammar and rhetoric; but he would not study Greek. At 15, he came home, and lived idle and vicious. At 17, he was sent to Carthage, where he shone as the first scholar in the rhetorical school. But he was dissipated, and became a Manichaean. He kept a mistress, who bore him a son when he was but 18. This son, named *Adeodatus*, was well educated, became pious, was baptized at the same time with his father, at the age of 15, and died soon after. While a student at Carthage, *Augustine* lost his father. By reading *Cicero's Hortensius*, he became enamoured with philosophy; and began to read the Bible, in search of it; but he could not there find that sublime system of which *Cicero* had given him an ideal, and he threw aside the sacred volume. At the age of 20 he had read and mastered nearly all the liberal sciences, as they were then taught. He now returned to Tagaste, and there opened a school for rhetoric. About the year 380, he again settled at Carthage, where he taught rhetoric about three years. During this period, his attachment to Manichaeism

obtained considerable reputation, by his handsomely written work *on the Schism of the Donatists*. (36) *Paulinus* of Nola, has left us some epistles and poems, which are neither very bad nor very good (37) *Rufinus*, a presbyter

diminished. He was restless, debauched, and unprincipled; yet was a fine scholar, and quite popular. In 383 he went to *Rome*, and the next year to *Milan*, in the character of a teacher of rhetoric. The eloquence of *Ambrose* drew him to attend public worship; and under the discourses of that able and faithful preacher, *Augustine's* mind was gradually enlightened, and his conscience awakened. He had sharp and painful convictions, and became altogether a new man. He was baptized A.D. 387, set out for *Africa* the same year, buried his mother, stopped at *Rome*, and did not reach *Africa* till A.D. 388. He sold his estate, and devoted the avails to charitable purposes; and for three years, lived as a recluse, with a few devout young men; and spent much time on scientific and metaphysical subjects. In the year 391, he went to *Hippo regius*, (now *Bona* in *Algiers*), where he was made a presbyter, and preached and laboured with great success. Four years after, *Valerius* his aged bishop, who was a native Greek, and who felt the need of such an assistant as the now renowned presbyter of *Hippo*, caused him to be ordained his colleague bishop. From A.D. 395 to A.D. 430, *Augustine*, as bishop of *Hippo*, was indefatigable in preaching, writing, combating error and vice, and infusing life and spirituality into the churches and clergy far and near. He died on the 28th of August, A.D. 430, aged 76 years. See *Care*, *Hist. Litterar. Tilenmont*, *Mémoires—à l'Hist. Eccles.*, vol. xiii., ed. Paris, (it is omitted in the Brussels ed.) *J. Stilling*, *Acta Sanctorum Augustini*, tom. vi., p. 213-460. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchenges.*, vol. xv., p. 219-530. *Jos. Milner's Church Hist.*, century v., ch. 2-9; and especially, *Augustini Confessionum libri xiii.*; written about A.D. 400, *Opp.*, tom. i., ed. *Benedict*.—The works of *Augustine* are so numerous, that even their titles cannot be here enumerated. Volume first, of the *Benedictine* edition, contains his *Retractions*, or corrections of his own works, in 2 books, written A.D. 426; his *Confessions*, in 13 books; and 13 works composed before he was a presbyter, on scientific, moral, and polemic subjects. Vol. second contains 270 epistles. Vol. third contains 16 treatises on biblical questions and subjects. Vol. fourth contains his exposition of the *Psalms*. Vol. fifth contains 394 of his popular sermons; and 317 falsely ascribed to him. Vol. sixth contains 31 tracts on moral, monastic, and practical subjects. Vol. seventh

is occupied by his 22 books *de Civitate Dei*, or history of the visible kingdom of God, from the creation, to the author's own times;—a most learned work. Vols. eighth, ninth, and tenth, contain his polemic works; viz. vol. 8th, against the *Manichees*, the *Arians*, the *Antitrinitarians*, the *Origenists*, and the *Jews*; vol. 9th, against the *Donatists*; and vol. 10th, against the *Pelagians*. The eleventh vol. contains his life, indices, &c.—*Tr.]*

(36) After the edition of *Gab. Albaspinus*, [Paris, 1631 and 1679. fol.], *Lud. Ell. du Pin*, doctor of the Sorbonne, published the works of *Optatus*, with judicious illustrations, [Paris, 1700, fol.—Of *Optatus*, about all that is known, is stated by *Jerome*, *de Viris Illust.*, c. 110, namely; “that he was an African and bishop of *Milcri*, who was on the side of the Catholics; and that he wrote, during the reign of *Valentinian* and *Valens*, (A.D. 364-375), six books against the slander of the *Donatists*; in which he maintains that the wrong doing of the *Donatists* is erroneously charged on us.”—His work is entitled, *Contra Parmenianum sectae Donatisticae apud Carthaginensem episcopum, de Schismate Donatistarum, libri vii.* It is a polemic work, in answer to a book published by *Parmenianus*; and contains much of the history of that schism, as well as of the arguments by which each party maintained its own principles, and defended its own conduct.—*Tr.]*

(37) The best edition of *Paulinus*, is that published by *Jo. Bapt. le Brun*, Paris, 1685, 4to, [in 2 volumes: which *L. A. Muratori* republished, with some additions, Verona, 1736, fol.—*Meropius Pontius Anicius Paulinus*, a Roman of patrician rank, was born at Bourdeaux in France, A.D. 353. He first studied under the poet *Decius Ausonius*; then went to *Rome*, became a popular advocate, and was made consul about the year 375. About 379, he commenced his travels or wanderings in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, accompanied by his pious wife *Theresia*. During this period he formed acquaintance with *St. Ambrose*, *St. Martin*, and many other eminent saints. He was baptized at Bourdeaux A.D. 391; and gradually parting with most of his large estate, which he bestowed in charity, he retired to Barcelona in Spain, where he lived some years as a recluse or monk. In 393 he was ordained a presbyter at Barcelona. The next year he removed to *Nola* in Campania, where he had a small estate, near to the

of *Aquileia*, acquired fame by translating into Latin various works of the Greeks, particularly of *Origen*; by his bitter contests with *Jerome*; and by some expositions of the holy scriptures. He would have held no contemptible rank among the Latin writers of this century, had it not been his misfortune to have the powerful and foul-mouthed *Jerome* for his adversary. (38)

grave and the church of *St. Felix*; at which numerous miracles were supposed to take place, and which of course was a great resort of the admirers of sacred relics and wonders. Here *Paulinus* in the year 402, erected an additional church, which he adorned with emblems of the Trinity and other religious devices. In 409 he became bishop of Nola, and remained in that office till his death in 431. He was esteemed one of the greatest saints; and was undoubtedly very religious, though his piety was of a superstitious cast. His writings consist of about 50 letters to his friends, written with a pleasing simplicity of style, and exhibiting a true picture of his devout mind, yet containing little that is of much importance; also 32 poetic effusions, of a similar character with his letters, 15 of which are in praise of *St. Felix*. He was highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and by the pious in after ages. For an account of him and his works, see *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustribus, c. 48, with the Notes of *Fabreius* in his Biblioth. Patristica; *Le Brun*, Vita *Paulini*, in his Opp. *Paulini*; *Cave*, Hist. Litterar.; *Schroeckh*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. vii., p. 123–132; *Jos. Milner*, Church Hist., century v., ch. 13.—*Tr.*]

(38) *Richard Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiast., par M. du Pin, tome i., p. 124, &c. A particular and full account is given of him, and his reputation is defended, by *Justus Fontanus*, Historia Litteraria Aquileiensis, lib. v., p. 149. [See also *P. Th. Cacciari*, Dissertatio Historica de Vita, Fide, &c. *Rufini*, subjoined to his edition of *Rufinus'* Hist. Eccl.; and *De Rubéis*, Dissert. de Tyranno *Rufino* Presbytero, &c., Venice, 1754, 4to.—*Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr., c. 17. *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. x., p. 112–133. *Cave*, Histor. Litter.—*Rufinus Toranus*, or *Tyrannius*, was probably born at *Concordia*, near *Aquileia*, about A.D. 330. After living several years in a monastery at *Aquileia*, and forming acquaintance with *Jerome*, he was baptized there in 371. Soon after, the fame of the Oriental monks led him to visit them. Landing at *Alexandria*, he became acquainted with a rich Roman lady, named *Melania*, who was as great an admirer of monkery as himself. She became his patron, supported him, and travelled with him, through the remainder of his life. During

his six years' residence in *Egypt*, he spent some time among the monks in the Nitric wilderness, and also heard lectures from the famous *Didymus* of *Alexandria*. About the year 378, he and *Melania* removed to *Jerusalem*, where they spent many years. *Melania* occupied a nunnery, in which she supported a considerable number of devout sisters. *Rufinus* resided with other monks, in cells about the Mount of *Olives*; was much respected, often visited by pilgrims, and lived in the greatest intimacy with *Jerome*, who then resided at *Bethlehem*. About the year 390, he was ordained a presbyter, by *John* bishop of *Jerusalem*; and soon after, the quarrel between him and *Jerome*, respecting *Origen's* orthodoxy, commenced. In the year 397, that controversy seemed to subside; and shortly after, *Rufinus* and *Melania* removed to *Rome*. Here his publications concerning *Origen*, rekindled the quarrel with *Jerome*; and both *Origen* and *Rufinus* were pronounced in the wrong by *Anastasius* the Roman pontiff. In the year 399, *Rufinus* removed to *Aquileia*; where he spent several years in translating works of *Origen*, and writing apologies for him and for himself. At length, after *Alaric* and his Goths began to lay waste all Italy, *Rufinus* and *Melania* set out for *Palestine*, and got as far as *Sicily*, where *Rufinus* closed his life A.D. 410.—*Rufinus* was a man of respectable talents, of considerable learning, a handsome writer, and a very diligent scholar. His orthodoxy and his piety ought never to have been called in question. The abusive treatment he received from *Jerome*, will account for the irritation of his feelings at times, without supposing him destitute of grace.—His work which is most frequently quoted in modern times, is his ecclesiastical history. The first nine Books are a free translation of the ten Books of *Eusebius*, with considerable omissions in the latter part, and some additions in the first seven Books. The two last Books, (the 10th and 11th), are a continuation by *Rufinus*. This work has been very severely censured; but of late, it is held to be of some value. The first good edition of it was, by *P. Th. Cacciari*, *Rome*, 1740, 2 vols. 4to.—Besides this, *Rufinus* wrote *Vitae Patrum*, or a history of the eastern monks; often published, and of about the same value as the other works of the kind; also an exposition of the Creed;

For an account of *Philastrius*,⁽³⁹⁾ *Damasus*,⁽⁴⁰⁾ *Juvencus*,⁽⁴¹⁾ and other writers of less note, the reader is referred to those who professedly treat of all the Christian writers. I will, however, just mention *Sulpitius Severus*, a Gaul, the best historian of that age;⁽⁴²⁾ and *Prudentius*, a Spaniard, and a poet of considerable merit.⁽⁴³⁾

the best that has reached us, from so early an age:—two Apologies for *Origen*, and a translation of *Pamphylus*' Apology for him:—two defences of himself against *Jerome*; one of which is lost:—Commentaries on 75 of the Psalms, and on Hosea, Joel, and Amos, if they are genuine.—He translated the works of *Josephus*; the Recognitions of *Clement*; various Commentaries of *Origen*, and his iv. Books de Principiis; several works of *Basil* the Great, of *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Anatolius* and *Evagrius*.—An imperfect collection of his works was published by *De la Barre*, Paris, 1580, fol. A much better edition in 2 vols. fol., was commenced at Verona, by *Domin. Vallarsi*, of which the first vol. appeared in 1745.—*Tr.*]

(39) [*Philastrius*, or *Philaster*, bishop of *Brescia* in the north of Italy, A.D. 379–387. While a presbyter, he is said to have travelled nearly all over the Roman empire, combating and endeavouring to convert errorists of every sort, and especially Arians. At Milan he was severely handled by *Auxentius* the Arian bishop. *Ambrose*, the successor of *Auxentius*, showed him kindness, and ordained him bishop of *Brescia*. His praises are told by *Gaudentius*, his immediate successor in the see of *Brescia*. His only work is, *de Hæresibus Liber*, in 150 chapters. It enumerates more heresies than any of the other ancient works; but no one considers it an accurate and able work. *Philastrius* was doubtless a pious and a well-meaning man; but he was incompetent to the task he undertook. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar*, and *Schroëckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. ix., p. 362–384. The work is extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. iv., p. 701, and ed. *Helmstadt*, 1611, 4to, and by *J. A. Fabricius*, Hamb., 1721, 8vo, and among the collected Works of the early bishops of *Brescia*, *Brixiae*, 1738, fol.—*Tr.*]

(40) [*Damasus*, bishop of Rome A.D. 366–384, is said to have been of Spanish extract, but his father was a presbyter of Rome, and he was probably born there about the year 305. On the death of *Felix*, A.D. 366, there was great competition for the episcopal chair; and two bishops were chosen and ordained, namely, *Damasus* and *Ursinus* or *Ursicinus*. Much confusion and even bloodshed followed. But the party of *Damasus* finally triumphed. *Damasus* was active in putting down Arianism in the

West; and being requested, he aided the eastern churches in healing their divisions. For these purposes he held several councils, and wrote several letters, some of which are extant. Two synodic epistles and a confession of faith are preserved by *Theodoret*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. 22, and l. v., c. 10, 11. An epistle to *Paulinus* bishop of *Antioch*, and about 40 epitaphs, inscriptions, epigrams, &c., are also extant. His book *de Virginitate* is lost. Several spurious epistles, as well as the *Liber Pontificalis*, or Brief History of the Popes, are falsely ascribed to him. The best edition of his works is that by *A. M. Merenda*, Rome, 1754, fol. See *Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.*, c. 103. *Cave*, *Histor. Litterar.* *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. i., p. 179–233, ed. 2d, Lond., 1749. *Merenda*, in his ed. of the works of *Damasus*, and *Schroëckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. viii., p. 107–122.—*Tr.*]

(41) [*Caius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus*. Nearly all that is known of the man, is told by *Jerome*, *de Viris Illustr.*, c. 84. He says: “*Juvencus*, of noble extract, a Spaniard, and a presbyter, composed four books, in which the four Gospels are put into hexameter verse, almost verbatim; also some poems in the same measure, relating to the order of the sacraments. He flourished under the emperor *Constantine*.” The four books of Evangelical History are of the nature of an imperfect Harmony of the Gospels, on the basis of Matthew. *Juvencus* possessed considerable poetic genius, and understood versification very well. His lines are flowing and easy; but he was more solicitous to give the history, truly, and as nearly as possible in the language of the Bible, than to decorate the narrative by flights of fancy and poetic imagery. The best edition is that of *Erh. Reusch*, *Frankf. and Leips.*, 1710, 8vo. The other poems mentioned by *Jerome*, are lost. But in the *Nova Collectio vet. Monumentorum*, tom. ix., p. 15, &c., by *Edw. Martene*, Paris, 1724–33, there is a poetic version of the book of Genesis, which bears the name of *Juvencus*. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.*, and *Schroëckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. v., p. 262–265.—*Tr.*]

(42) [*Sulpitius Severus* was born in Aquitaine Gaul, of noble extract, and brought up under *Phacadius* bishop of *Agen* in Guienne. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards became an advocate, and married a

lady of consular rank. Subsequently he became a monk under *St. Martin*, and a presbyter at Primulium, a village between Narbonne and Toulouse. He was intimate with *St. Martin* of Tours, *Paulinus* of Nola, and *Jerome*. In his old age, *Gennadius* tells us, he was entangled by the metaphysics of the Pelagians; but recovering himself, he ever after kept silence. He is supposed to have died about A.D. 420, far advanced in life. His style is chaste and neat, much beyond the age in which he lived; whence he has been called the *Christian Sallust*. His best work is a Church History, (*Historia Sacra*), in two books, from the creation to A.D. 400. It is a condensed narrative, in a very classic style, and composed with some ability and fidelity. Besides this, he wrote the Life of *St. Martin*; three epistles concerning him; and three dialogues on the miracles of the Oriental monks, and on those of *St. Martin*. Several epistles of his are lost. To him *Paulinus* of Nola addressed 14 epistles, which are still extant. His works have been often printed. The last edition, perhaps, is that of *G. Hornius*, Lugd. Bat., 1647, 4to; often reprinted, 8vo. See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr., c. 19. *Cave*, *Historia Litteraria*.—*Tr.*]

(43) [*Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*, of Spain, was born A.D. 348; but whether at Tarragona, Callahorra, or Saragossa, is not settled. In his youth he studied eloquence, and afterwards managed causes and filled civil offices, as an unprincipled man. He was openly vicious, and he served some time in the army. At length, when turned of 50, he became thoughtful, his whole character was changed, and he devoted himself to writing moral and religious poetry. In the year 405, he wrote *Καθημερινῶν*, or 12 Latin hymns, adapted to our daily devotions. His other poems are, *Ψυχομαχία*, or the conflict between virtuous and vicious passions; *περὶ γεφάνων*, or fourteen elegies on various martyrs; *ἀποθέσεις*, or on the divine nature, in opposition to pagans and heretics; *ἀμαρτιγενεῖα*, or the origin of sin; two Books against *Symmachus*, and the worship of idols; and, (if it be genuine), *διπτοχαῖον*, or a *dessert*, taken from the Old and New Testaments; some write it *διπτερον*, the *Diptyc* or list of saints in the Old and New Testaments. His commentary on the Hexæmeron is lost. *Prudentius* was something of a poet; but has been greatly overrated by many. His diction is not pure, nor his versification correct, and his thoughts are often flat prose, and drag along to excessive length. A good critic has observed, that he was a better Christian than poet. Yet he has many agreeable passages, and some that are really

fine. He also serves to illustrate the history and the religious views of the age in which he lived. His collected works were published, by *Weitzel*, Hanov., 1613, 8vo; with notes by *Heinsius*, Amstelod., 1667, 12mo; and in usum Delphini, Paris, 1687, 4to.—See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr., c. 13. *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar.* *Schrocekh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. vii., p. 100–123.

The Latin writers of inferior note, omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*, are the following.

Anastasia, a noble Roman lady, the wife of *Publius*, and a martyr in the Diocletian persecution A.D. 303. Two letters addressed from her prison to *Chrysogonus*, a confessor, are extant under her name. See *Suidas*, in voce *χρυσόγονος*.

Theonas, a bishop, but where is not known. An excellent letter of his, addressed to *Lucian* the emperor's chamberlain, is extant in *Dacherii* Addit. ad Spicileg., tom. xi., or the new ed., tom. iii., p. 297. It is supposed to have been written about A.D. 305. But whether the present Latin is the original, or only a translation, is uncertain. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar.*, vol. i., p. 172, 173.

Rheticus, bishop of *Autun* in France. He was in high esteem during the reign of *Constantine*; and wrote a commentary on the Canticles, and a great volume against the Novatians; both of which are lost. *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 82.

Donatus, an African bishop, from whom the *Donatist* faction took its name. According to *Jerome*, (de Viris Illustr., c. 93), he wrote many tracts in support of his sect; and likewise a book on the Holy Spirit, which accorded with Arian views. None of his works are extant. He was expelled from Carthage A.D. 356.

Julius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 337–352, a strenuous opposer of the Arians, and a patron of *Athanasius*. Two of his epistles are extant, one addressed to the Oriental bishops, and the other to the Alexandrians, in favour of *Athanasius*. Both are preserved in the works of *Athanasius*, and the latter also by *Soerates*, *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. ii., c. 22. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar.*, and *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*.

Julius Firmicus Maternus, probably was first a pagan, and then a Christian. He wrote a book on the falsehood of the pagan religions, addressed to the emperors *Constantinus* and *Constans*, which has been often printed. There are extant, likewise, eight books on astronomy or mathematics, which bear his name.

Fortunatianus, born in Africa, and for many years bishop of *Aquileia* in Italy. After contending long and strenuously against the Arians, he joined with them in 354, and

became as active against the orthodox. He wrote commentaries on the Gospels: but nothing of his remains.

Vitellius, an African Donatist, who flourished about A.D. 344. He wrote on the world's hatred to the servants of God; against the pagans; against the Catholics as traitors; and some other tracts. See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr., c. 4. Nothing of his remains.

Macrobius of Africa. As a Catholic presbyter, he wrote a book addressed to confessors and virgins; afterwards, as a Donatist bishop resident at Rome, he composed the martyrdom of Maximianus and Isaac, two Donatists. A large fragment of the last, is extant in *Mabillon*, Analect., tom. iv. He flourished A.D. 344.

Liberius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 352-366. He had a warm discussion with the emperor *Constantius*, in the year 355, at Milan, respecting the persecution of the orthodox by the Arians; for his opposition to whom, he was banished. During his exile, he relapsed, signed an Arian creed; and was restored, A.D. 358. His dialogue with the emperor at Milan, is extant, in *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccl., l. ii., c. 16; and 16 of his epistles are collected in the *Acta Conciliorum*, tom. ii., col. 743.

Eusebius Vercellensis, was a native of Sardinia, and first a lector at Rome, then bishop of *Vercelli* in the north of Italy, and flourished A.D. 354. For his vigorous opposition to the Arian cause, he was banished in 355, first to Scythopolis in Syria, thence to Cappadocia, and afterwards to Thebais in Egypt. Under *Julian* he regained his liberty, travelled extensively in the eastern provinces, was at several councils, and returning to Italy, died A.D. 371. He translated the commentary on the Psalms by *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, into Latin; but it is lost; and wrote four letters which are still extant. A manuscript of the four evangelists, according to the old Italic version, written with his own hand, is preserved in the archives of the church of *Vercelli*, and was published by *J. A. Irci*, Milan, 1748.

Lucifer Caladitanus, a bishop in Sardinia, contemporary with *Eusebius Vercellensis*, and his companion in exile. He was founder of the sect called *Luciferians*, who held no communion with Arians, or even with such as had been Arians. *Lucifer* was a man of violent passions, and bold even to rashness. He addressed two indecorously written books to the emperor *Constantius*; and wrote likewise, *On apostate Princes*; *On having no intercourse with heretics*; *On showing no indulgence to offenders against God*; *That life is to be sacrificed for the Son of God*; and a short *Epistle to Florentius*.

These were published, Paris, 1568, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. iv., p. 181; but the best ed. is by *Joh. Dominic* and *Ja. Coleti*, Venice, 1778, fol.

Hilarius, a native of Sardinia, deacon at Rome, and associated with *Eusebius Vercellensis*, and *Lucifer Caladit.* in an embassy to *Constantius*, and by him sent with them into exile. He became a *Luciferian*. To him are attributed—though without sufficient proof—the Questions on the Old and New Testaments, printed among the works of *Augustine*, vol. iv., and the Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, published among the works of *Ambrose*.

Phocadius, bishop of *Agen* in the south of France, from at least 359-392. He was famous, in connexion with the three preceding, in the Arian contests in the West. His book against the Arians, is still extant in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. iv., p. 300, ed. Paris, 1589; and by *Cusp. Barth*, Francf., 1623, 8vo.

Zeno, bishop of Verona, who flourished about A.D. 390. To him are ascribed 90 sermons on various texts and subjects, which were compiled from *Basil*, *Hilary*, and others. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. iii., p. 359.

Fabius Marius Victorinus, of African birth, was a distinguished pagan rhetorician at Rome, who became a convert to Christianity about the middle of this century, and died about A.D. 370. While a pagan he wrote or translated several treatises on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric; most of which are lost. After his conversion, he wrote, on the holy Trinity; against the Arians, iv. books; to *Justin* the Manichean; (against the Manichean principle of two first causes); on the commencement of the day; (whether it be at evening, or in the morning); on the generation of the divine Word; against *Candidus* the Arian; three hymns; (on embracing the homoousian faith); a Poem on the seven Maccabees; and Commentaries on some of Paul's epistles; which were never published. His style is intricate, obscure, and inelegant. Most of what he wrote after his conversion, is extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, tom. iv., p. 293. See *Jerome*, de Viris Illustr., c. 101, with the Notes of *J. A. Fabricius*.

Candidus, an Arian, who flourished about A.D. 364. He composed a book on the divine generation, addressed to *F. M. Victorinus*, which, with the answer of *Victorinus*, was published by *Andr. Rivinus*, Gothae, 1656.

Parianus, bishop of Barcelona in Spain, who flourished about the year 370, and died before A.D. 390. He wrote a book called

Cervus, which is lost; also three epistles against the Novatians; an Exhortation to penitence; and a tract on Baptism, addressed to catechumens: all of which were published, Paris, 1538, 4to, Rome, 1564, fol., Biblioth. Patrum, tom. iv., and still better, in *Aguirre*, Collectio Max. Concil. Hispan., tom. ii., p. 79, &c.

Anicia Fulconia Proba, a noble lady of Rome, distinguished for her rank, her piety, and her beneficence. She flourished about A.D. 370. After the death of her husband, she lost most of her property by the incursion of the Goths, and fell into the hands of *Alaric*, who carried her to Africa, where she died in the first part of the fifth century. Her *Cento Virgilianus de rebus divinis*, is extant in the Bib. Patr., tom. v., p. 1218, and Cologne, 1601, 8vo, and Halle, 1719, 8vo.

Faustinus, a presbyter among the Luciferians at Rome, flourished A.D. 384. He wrote a petition to the emperors *Valentinian*, *Theodosius*, and *Arcadius*; to which is prefixed a confession of faith; and subjoined is, the Rescript of *Theodosius*. He also wrote a book on the Trinity, against the Arians. His works are in the Bib. Patrum, tom. v., p. 673, and were printed, Oxford, 1678, 8vo.

Siricius, bishop of Rome A.D. 385–398, is the earliest Roman pontiff whose Decretal Epistles are allowed to be genuine. Five of his Epistles are in the *Acta Concilior.*, tom. ii., but the 4th, which is addressed to the bishops of Africa, is demonstrably spurious. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. viii., p. 122–129; and *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, vol. i., p. 233–277.

Idacius Clarus was a Spanish bishop, perhaps of Merida, and flourished A.D. 385. He was conspicuous as an opposer of the Priscillianists; suffered banishment; and wrote an Apologeticum, which is lost; a book against *Virimundus*, an Arian deacon; Explanation of some difficult passages of scripture; and other tracts against heresies: all of which are extant in the Biblioth. Patrum, tom. v., p. 726.

Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia in northern Italy, (a different person from *Gaudentius*, a contemporary Donatist bishop of Tamugada in Africa), was travelling in the Asiatic provinces, when he was elected successor to *Philastrius* bishop of Brescia, and was compelled to return and accept the office. He brought with him from the East, relics of about 40 saints; and served the church till A.D. 410, or, as some say, till 427. He wrote 15 discourses or tracts on various subjects; also, On the unjust steward; On the text, My Father is greater than I; and the Life of *Philastrius*: all published, Petav., 1720, 4to.

Aurelius, bishop of Carthage A.D. 390–426, was a man of much influence, and wrote, A.D. 419, a circular Epistle on the condemnation of *Pelagius* and *Coelestius*; which, with the letter of the emperor *Honorius* to him, on the same subject, is in *Baronius*, Annals, A.D. 419, t. v., p. 455, and in the Concilior. Collect., tom. ii., col. 1609.

Tichonius, or *Tychonius*, flourished A.D. 390. He was a learned, moderate Donatist; and wrote vii. Rules for interpreting scripture, (extant in the Biblioth. Patrum, tom. vi., p. 49); iii. Books on intestine war; Explanation of divers causes; and a Commentary on the Apocalypse. Some have supposed, the 18 Lectures on the Apocalypse, printed among the works of Augustine, to be this Commentary of *Tichonius*. See *Gennadius*, de Viris Illustr., c. 18. *Augustine*, de Doctrina Christiana, l. iii., c. 30; and *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. xi., p. 374–382.

Petilianus, a leading Donatist bishop in Numidia, flourished A.D. 399. He wrote, de uno Baptismo; and a circular Epistle to his party: to both which *Augustine* wrote formal answers. His works are lost.

Faustus, a Manichaean bishop in Africa, flourished A.D. 400. He wrote a book against the orthodox faith; which *Augustine* quotes entire, and refutes at large, in 33 Books.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. State of Theological Learning.—§ 2. Increase of Superstition.—§ 3. Hence innumerable Pious Frauds.—§ 4. Interpreters of the Sacred Volume.—§ 5. Mode of explaining the Christian Doctrines.—§ 6. Doctrinal Writers.—§ 7. State of Controversial Theology.—§ 8. Disingenuous Methods of Disputing.—§ 9. The principal Disputants.—§ 10. Practical Theology.—§ 11. Faults of the Moral Writers.—§ 12. The Number of Mystics increased, and their Doctrines established.—§ 13, 14. Monkish Societies.—§ 15. Different Orders of Monks.—§ 16. Two pernicious Moral Doctrines.—§ 17. Lives and Morals of Christians.—§ 18. Controversy with Meletians.—§ 19. The Eustathian Troubles.—§ 20. The Luciferians.—§ 21. The Aërian Controversy.—§ 22. Jovinianus.—§ 23. Controversies relating to Origen.—§ 24. Their Extension.—§ 25. Controversy respecting his Writings.

§ 1. THAT the elementary principles of the Christian religion were preserved entire and inviolate, in most churches, is certain: but it is equally certain, that they were very often unskilfully and confusedly explained and defended. This is manifest from the discussions concerning the three persons in the Godhead, among those who approved the decisions of the council of Nice. There is so little clearness and discrimination in these discussions, that they seem to rend the one God into *three* Gods. Moreover those idle fictions, which a regard for the Platonic philosophy and for the prevailing opinions of the day had induced most theologians to embrace even before the times of *Constantine*, were now in various ways confirmed, extended, and embellished. Hence it is that we see, on every side, evident traces of excessive veneration for departed saints, of a purifying fire for souls when separated from the body, of the celibacy of the clergy, of the worship of images and relics, and of many other opinions, which in process of time almost banished the true religion, or at least very much obscured and corrupted it.

§ 2. Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which originated partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites and combine them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion. At first, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs; as if, *thence* men could bear away the radical principles of holiness, and certain hopes of salvation.(1) Next, from Palestine and

(1) See *Gregory Nyssen*, Oratio ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt, Opp., tom. iii., p. 568. *Hieronymus*, Ep. xii., ad Paulinum, de institut. Monachi, Opp., tom. i., p. 66. *Ja. Gothofred*, ad Codicem Theodos., tom. vi., p. 65, &c. *Peter Wesseling*, Diss. de caussis peregrinat. Hierosolymit., prefixed to the Itinerarium Burdigalense; among the Vetera Romanor. Itineraria, p. 537.—[*Helena*, the mother of *Constantine* the Great, seems to have been the first who gave the

signal for these religious journeys. At least, it is stated by *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl., l. i., c. 17, and by *Theodoret*, H. E., lib. i., c. 18, that she was instructed by a dream to go to Jerusalem, and that she wished to find the grave of *Christ*; that she actually did find three crosses, with a superscription; that one of them instantly cured a dying woman, and was therefore concluded to be the cross of *Christ*. She gave a part of it to the city of Jerusalem; and sent the other part to the

from places venerated for their sanctity, portions of dust or of earth were brought; as if they were the most powerful protection against the assaults of evil spirits; and these were bought and sold everywhere at great prices.(2) Further, the public supplications by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed and the same privileges assigned as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues and lustrations before the advent of *Christ*. Images indeed were as yet but rare, and statues did not exist. And shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt, that the worship of the martyrs,—with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the Christian cause,—was modelled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods.(3) From these specimens the intelligent reader will be able to conceive, how much injury resulted to Christianity from the peace and repose procured by *Constantine* and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion. But the plan of this work will not admit of long details respecting such enormities.

§ 3. This unenlightened piety of the common people opened a wide door to the endless frauds of persons who were base enough to take advantage of the ignorance and errors of others disingenuously to advance their own interests. Rumours were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders to be seen in certain edifices and places, (a trick before this time practised by the pagan priests), whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon everything new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon.(4) Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not;(5) the list of saints was enriched with fictitious names; and even robbers were converted into martyrs.(6) Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream, that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred.(7) Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude with ludicrous combats with evil spirits.(8) It would require a volume to detail the various impositions which were, for the most part successfully, practised by artful knaves, after genuine piety and true religion were compelled to resign their dominion in great measure to superstition.

emperor, who encased it in his own statue, and regarded it as the *Palladium* of his new city; and that the people used to assemble around this statue with wax candles. See *J. Andr. Schmidt*, *Problem. de crucis Dominicæ per Helenam Constantini Imp. matrem inventione*, Helinst., 1724.—*Schl.*]

(2) *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, l. xxii., c. 8, § 6, and many others.

(3) This is shown at length, by *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, tom. ii., p. 642, &c.

(4) *Henry Dodwell's* *Dissertat.* ii., in Ire-

naeum, § 56, p. 196, &c. *Jo. le Clerc*, in his *Append. Augustiniana*, p. 492, 550, 575.

(5) *Concilium Carthagin.* v. Canon 14, tom. i. *Conciliorum*, p. 988, ed. Harduin.

(6) *Sulpitius Severus*, de Vita S. Martini, cap. 8.

(7) *Augustine*, *Sermo* 318, § 1, Opp., tom. v., p. 886, ed. Antwerp.

(8) See *Ja. Gothofred*, ad *Codicem Theodos.*, tom. iii., p. 172. *Augustine*, de opere Monachorum, cap. 28, § 36, Opp., tom. vi., p. 364. *Jerome*, *Epistola ad Rusticum*, Opp., tom. i., p. 45.

§ 4. Many laboured earnestly, few successfully, on the sacred volume. *Jerome*, a man of great industry and not unskilful in the languages, made a new Latin translation of all the sacred books; which was more lucid, and considerably better than any of the numerous old Latin versions.(9) He also took much pains to set forth a more correct edition of the Greek version by the Seventy: and the same thing, we are told, was undertaken by *Eusebius*, *Athanasius*, and *Euthalius*.(10) The expositors of scripture form a long list; among whom the most distinguished are *Jerome*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius*, *Diodorus* of Tarsus, *Rufinus*, *Ephraim* Syrus, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, and *Didymus*. Yet few of these have correctly discharged the duty of interpreters. *Rufinus*, indeed, *Theodorus* of Heraclea, *Diodorus*, and a few others, followed the literal sense of scripture:(11) the rest, after the example of *Origen* their guide, search for recondite meanings; and accommodate, or rather constrain the half-understood language of the Bible, to speak of sacred mysteries and a Christian life.(12) *Augustine* and *Tychonius*, wished to establish rules for interpretation; but neither of them had ability to do it.(13)

§ 5. The doctors, who were distinguished for their learning, explained the sacred doctrines after the manner of *Origen*, (on whom they all fixed their eye), in accordance with the principles of that philosophy which they learned in their youth at school, namely, the Platonic philosophy as corrected by *Origen*. Those who wish to get a full insight into this subject, may examine *Gregory* Nazianzen among the Greeks, and *Augustine*

(9) See *Ja. Fran. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii., p. 1332, &c.—[That there were many Latin versions extant in the fourth century, is very clearly stated by *Augustine*, de *Doctrina Christiana*, l. ii., c. 11. Of these, (as *Augustine* tells us, loc. cit.), one was called (*Itala*) the *Italic*. But it has become usual to apply this designation to every ancient Latin version, which was not amended by *Jerome*; and this has given occasion to many mistakes. See *Mosheim*, de Reb. Christianor. ante Const. M., p. 225–229. *Jerome* mentions a version, which he calls (*Vulgata*) the *vulgar*, and which counsellor *Michaelis* takes to be that used at Rome in the days of *Jerome*. These translations, in respect to their diction, were neither classical nor tolerable; yet they may be of use to those who wish to become acquainted with the Latin language in its fullest extent. They contain an immense number of Hebraisms, or rather Syriasms; which leads to the conjecture, that their authors were in great measure Jews. These versions fell into great disorder, in which no two copies were alike; because different translations were in fact blended together, the expressions of one evangelist were transferred into the narrative of another, and many glosses were incorporated into the text. This induced the Roman bishop *Damasus* to commit the improving of these ancient versions to *Jerome*, who undertook the business in the

year 384. He erased the false and incorrect readings, and improved the translations, which came into his hands very faulty, uniformly guiding himself by the original text. This improved version of *Jerome* is, a few alterations excepted, that *Vulgate* which is held in so high estimation by the Catholic church. The really new translation of the Bible by *Jerome*, was published from manuscripts, by the Benedictine monks *Jo. Martianay* and *Ant. Pouget*, Paris, 1693, under the title: *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi divina Bibliotheca, hac tenus inedita*. Their Prolegomena are worth reading. See *Rich. Simon*, *Histoire critique des Versions du nouveau Test.*, cap. 7–12, and *Michaelis*, *Introduction to the N. T.*—*Schl.*]

(10) *Jo. Frick*, de *Canone Novi Testamenti*, p. 180.

(11) *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiast.*, par M. du Pin, tom. i. p. 51, 90, 129, and tom. iv., p. 335, &c., and *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.*, cap. vi., &c., p. 88, &c.

(12) See *Gregory* Nazianzen, *Carmen de se ipso*; in *Ja. Tollu*, *Insignib. Itineris Italici*, p. 27, 57. He very much commends this method.

(13) *Augustine*, in his vi. Books de *Doctrina Christiana*; *Tychonius*, in his vii. Rules of Interpretation; which are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum maxima*, tom. vi., p. 48.

among the Latins; who were regarded in the subsequent ages as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and may be fitly styled, next to *Origen*, the parents and supporters of philosophic or *scholastic* theology. They were both admirers of *Plato*, and held as certain all his decisions which were not absolutely repugnant to the truths of Christianity; and proceeding upon these as their first principles, they drew from them many and very subtle conclusions. Yet there was another class of theologians, which daily increased in number; namely, that of men who supposed the knowledge of divine things was to be acquired, not by *reasoning* about them, but by *contemplation*, and by recalling the mind from its converse with external objects to a concentration on itself. These are commonly called *mystics*. That these abounded, appears from several considerations, and particularly from the numerous herds of monks who were spread nearly all over the Christian world, and from the works of *Dionysius*, (that Coryphaeus of the mystics), which were produced, it seems, in this age, and by some one of this class.

§ 6. Among the writings of this age, in which the doctrines of Christianity are stated and explained, the first place is justly due to the catechetical Discourses of *Cyril*, bishop of Jerusalem. For those who would persuade us, that these Discourses were the production of a subsequent age, are so blinded by zeal for a party, as not to discern the truth.(14) Many would also here place the Divine Institutions of *Lactantius*; but improperly, because these Institutes were designed rather to confute those who still adhered to polytheism, than to unfold the truths taught by inspiration. The *System of Doctrine addressed to the clergy and laity*, which is ascribed to *Athanasius*, appears to have been the production of a later age.(15) There are however, in the works of *Athanasius*, *Chrysostom*, the *Gregories*, and others, as now extant, many passages from which we may learn how the best informed men of this age handled the leading topics of the Christian religion. On the *Trinity* in particular, we have the twelve Books of *Hilary* of Poitiers. The Ancoratus of *Epiphanius* explains the doctrine concerning *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*. On *baptism*, we have the work of *Pacianus*, addressed to catechumens; and a work of *Chrysostom*, on the same subject, in two Books. The works of *Jerome*, *Augustine*, and others, which were designed to impart correct views on religious subjects, and to confute the opposers of the truth, are here omitted.

§ 7. From the disputes with those who were regarded as opposed to divine truth, the ancient simplicity had nearly taken its flight; and in place of it, dialectical subtilities and quibbles, invectives, and other disingenuous artifices had succeeded, more becoming the patrons, than the opposers of error. Censures of this habit, by men of eminence, are still extant.(16) I pass in silence those rhetorical figures and flourishes, by which many endeavoured to parry the weapons of their adversaries, and to involve in obscurity the question under discussion; likewise the inclination to excite odium against their antagonists, so common to many; and the disregard of proper arrangement and of perspicuity, and other

(14) See *Jo. Fecht*, Comment. de origine Missarum in honorem Sanctorum, p. 404, &c.

(15) [It is not so much a treatise on dogmatics, as one on morals, containing rules of life, especially for monks.—*Schl.*]

(16) *Methodius*, cited by *Epiphanius*, Hæresis 64, Opp., tome i., page 563: *Gregory Nazianzen*, in many places: and others.

habits which were no better in their discussions. Yet so far were some writers of this century from disguising these faults, that they rather claimed praise for them. It must be owned, however, that their antagonists made use of the same weapons.

§ 8. With the ancient form of discussion, new *sources of argument* were in this age combined. For the truth of doctrines was proved by the number of martyrs who had believed so, by prodigies, and by the confessions of devils, that is, of persons in whose bodies some demon was supposed to reside. The discerning cannot but see, that all proofs drawn from such sources are very fallacious, and very convenient for dishonest men who would practise imposition. And I greatly fear, that most of those who at this time resorted to such proofs, notwithstanding they were grave and eminent men, may be justly charged with the dangerous propensity to use deception. *Ambrose*, in controversy with the Arians, brings forward persons possessed with devils, who, when the relics of *Gervasius* and *Probasius* are produced, are constrained to cry out, that the doctrine of the Nicene council concerning three persons in the Godhead, is true and divine, and the doctrine of the Arians false and pernicious. This testimony of the prince of darkness, *Ambrose* regards as proof altogether unexceptionable. But the Arians openly ridiculed the prodigy and maintained, that *Ambrose* had bribed these infernals to bear testimony in his favour.(17) And many, I am aware, will be more inclined to believe the Arians, than to give credit to *Ambrose*; notwithstanding he is enrolled among saints, and they among heretics.(18)

§ 9. Besides *Apollinaris*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Cyril of Alexandria*, and others, who confuted the emperor *Julian*; the adherents to idolatry were vigorously and successfully encountered by *Lactantius*, by *Athanasius*, by *Julius Firmicus Maternus*, by the younger *Apollinaris*, whose books against *Porphyry* are unhappily lost, by *Augustine*, in his twenty-two Books on the City of God, and in his three lost Books against the pagans, and above all, by *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, in his Evangelical Preparation, and in his book against *Hierocles*. Attempts to convert the Jews were made by *Eusebius* of Emessa, by *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and by *Chrysostom*, in his six Books still extant. Against all the heresies, *Ephraim Syrus*,(19) *James* of Nisibis, *Didymus*, and *Audentius* took up the pen. So did *Epiphanius*, in his extensive work on the heresies, which he denominated Panarium: and *Gregory Nazianzen*, more concisely, in his Oration on the Faith. The short works of *Augustine* and *Philastrius*, rather enumerate the heresies, than confute them.

§ 10. The state of moral or practical theology would have been very flourishing, if the progress of any branch of knowledge could be measured by the number of the writers on it; for very many laboured to perfect and inculcate practical religion. Among the Orientals, the efforts of *James* of Nisibis, or as some say, of *Saruga*,(20) and *Ephraim Syrus*,

(17) *Ambrose*, Epist. xxii., p. 878, &c. *Paulinus*, de Vita Ambrosii, p. 81.

(18) See *Jo. le Clerc*, Appendix Augustiniana, p. 375. More examples of this kind might be mentioned. See *Gregory Nyssen*, de Vita Gregorii Neo-Cæsariensis, Opp. tom. ii., p. 977, 978. *Sulpitius Severus*, Historia Sacra, l. ii., c. 38, p. 261.

(19) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 118, 125, &c. From his extracts, it appears that *Ephraim*, though a pious man, was not a dexterous polemic.

(20) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, in his Biblioth. Orient., &c., tom. i., p. 17, thinks, that the writings ascribed to *James* of Nisibis, should

were very considerable in this department. What we meet with respecting the life and duties of a Christian, in the writings of *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others, can neither be altogether approved, nor wholly condemned. Many give the preference to the three Books of *Ambrose*, on the duties of ministers of the church, which are written after the manner of *Cicero* : and they certainly deserve commendation, so far as the intentions of the writer and the elegance of his thoughts are concerned ; but they contain many things, which may be justly censured. Perhaps, before all others who wrote on practical piety, the preference is due to *Macarius*, the Egyptian monk ;(21) from whom, after deducting some superstitious notions, and what savours too much of Origenism, we may collect a beautiful picture of real piety.

§ 11. About all the writers in this department, are defective in the following respects. First, they pay no regard to method and a just arrangement of their thoughts on the subject they attempt to explain. They rarely define, and never divide their subject, but pour out promiscuously whatever comes up in their pious but not very clear and correct minds. In the next place, they either neglect to trace the duties of men back to their sources and to their first principles, or they derive them from precepts and doctrines which are either manifestly false or not well ascertained. Lastly, when they come to the proof of their positions, most of them do not resort to the law of God for arguments to enforce duty and put down vice, but to airy fancies, to frigid allegories, and fine spun subtleties, better suited to tickle the imagination than to awaken and overpower the conscience.

§ 12. But still their works are far more tolerable, than that combination of the precepts of *Christ* with the precepts of *Plato*, (or rather with those of the Alexandrine philosophers the followers of *Ammonius Saccas*), and that twofold kind of piety, the one more perfect and complete, and the other less so, which almost all now embraced. How very much these views of religion had gained ground, may appear from the fact, that those who had long eried up a sort of recondite and mysterious knowledge of divine things, wholly different from the common knowledge of the vulgar, ventured in this century to carry out their views and reduce them to a regular system. For it is most probable, that it was among the Greeks of this century, (though some think it was earlier, and some that it was later), lived that fanatic, who assumed the name and the character of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, the disciple of *St. Paul* ; and who under the cover of this shield gave laws and instructions to those that wished to become separated from the world and to bring back the soul—that sundered particle of the divine nature—to its pristine state by contemplation.(22) As soon as the

rather be ascribed to a person of *Saruga*. But in his addenda, p. 558, he modifies his opinion in some measure.

(21) See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Januarii, tom. i., p. 1005. [See the brief account of him and his writings, in note (28), p. 246, supra. — *Tr.*]

(22) Those who have written concerning this deceiver, are enumerated by *Jo. Fran. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, l. ii., c. iv., § 8, p. 602, &c. See also *Jo. Launois*,

Judicium de scriptis Dionysii, Opp., tom. ii., pt i., p. 562. *Matur. Veiss de la Croze*, in his *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 10, &c., endeavours to prove that *Synesius*, a celebrated philosopher and bishop in Egypt, of the fifth century, was the author of the *Dionysian* writings ; and that he designed by them to support the doctrine of but *one nature* in *Christ*. But he uses feeble arguments. Nor are those more substantial, by which *Jo. Phil. Baratier* (in his *Diss. sub-*

writings of this man spread among the Greeks and Syrians, and especially among the solitaries and monks, it is not easy to describe, how much darkness came over the minds of many, and what an accession of numbers was made to those who maintained that converse with God is to be had by mortifying the senses, withdrawing the thoughts from all external objects, subduing the body with hunger and hardships, and fixing the attention on God and eternal things, in a kind of holy indolence.

§ 13. The truth of these remarks is evinced, by that vast multitude of monks and sacred virgins who, as soon as peace was given to the Christians, spread themselves with astonishing rapidity over the whole Christian world. Many persons of this description had long been known among the Christians, living as solitaries, in the deserts of Egypt. But *Antony* was the first who, in the year 305, collected them into an associated community in Egypt, and regulated their mode of living by fixed rules. (23) His disciple *Hilarion*, the next year, undertook the same thing in Palestine and Syria. About the same time, *Aones* or *Eugenius*, with his associates *Gaddana* and *Azyzo*, introduced this mode of life into Mesopotamia and the neighbouring countries. (24) These were imitated by many others, with so much success, that in a short time all the East swarmed with persons who, abandoning the occupations and conveniences of life and all intercourse with society, pined away amid various hardships, hunger and sufferings, in order to attain to a more close communion with God and the angels. The Christian church would have remained free from these numerous tortures of the mind and body, had not that great and fascinating doctrine of the ancient philosophy gained credence among Christians, that to attain to happiness and communion with God, the soul must be freed from the influence of the body, and for this purpose, the body must be subdued.

§ 14. This austere discipline passed from the East into the West, and first into Italy and the adjacent islands, though it is uncertain who conveyed it thither. (25) Afterwards, *St. Martin*, the celebrated bishop of Tours,

joined to his book *de successione Romanor. Episcop.*, p. 286, endeavours to prove, that *Dionysius* of Alexandria was the true author of those writings.—[The real author of these works is wholly unknown. That he was not *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite*, mentioned Acts xvii., 34, as he pretends to be, and was generally believed to be, from the sixth century on to the fifteenth, is certain. That he was a Greek who lived some time in the fourth century, is generally admitted; though some place him a century later. That he was *Apollinaris* senior, or junior, of *Laodicea*, several have laboured to evince; but without much success. He was orthodox, pious, and certainly not destitute of talent. His works consist of single Books, on the Cœlestial Hierarchy, or the invisible world, the church above; on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, or the visible church of God on the earth, its order, worship, and ordinances; on the Divine Names, or the designations of God in the Scriptures; on Mystical Theology, or on the perfections of God; and

eleven epistles. These, with the commentaries of some of the later Greek theologians, and notes by the moderns, were printed Gr. and Lat., Antwerp, 1634, and Paris, 1644, 2 vols. fol. See *Cave*, *Historia Litterar.* *Dauillé*, *de Scriptis Dionysii Areopagitæ*, *Genevæ*, 1666, 4to. Bp. *Pearson*, *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, p. i., c. 10.—*Tr.*]

(23) *Antony* and his regulations are treated of in the *Acta Sanctor.* ad diem 17, Januarii, tom. ii., p. 107.

(24) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 48, &c.

(25) The majority follow *Baronius*, maintaining that it was *St. Athanasius* who, about the year 340, transplanted the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, and erected the first monastery at Rome. See *Mabillon*, *Præfatio ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.*, tom. i., p. ix, &c. But *Lud. Ant. Muratori* opposes this opinion, and contends that the first European monastery was built at Milan. *Antiq. Italicar. mediæ ævi*, tom. v., p. 364.

erected some monasteries in Gaul; and his example and his discourses produced such eagerness to embrace a monastic life, that two thousand monks are said to have assembled together at his funeral. (26) From thence this mode of life gradually extended over the other countries of Europe. Those studious of such matters however, must know, that there has always been a wide difference between the monks of the West and those of the East; and that the former could never be brought to bear the severe rules, to which the latter voluntarily submitted. For our part of the world is not so filled with persons who are by nature austere, morose, delirious, and fanatical, as those Oriental regions are; nor will our bodies endure that abstemiousness in regard to nourishment, which those will which were born under a dry and burning atmosphere. It was therefore rather the name and the shadow of that solitary life which *Antony* and others instituted in the East, than the thing itself, which was brought into the countries of Europe. (27)

§ 15. These monks (28) were not all of the same kind; for first, they were divided into *Coenobites* and *Eremites*. The former lived and ate together in the same house, and were associated under a leader and head, whom they called *Father*, or in the Egyptian tongue, *Abbot*. (29) The lat-

Again, *Just. Fontinanus*, in his *Historia Litterar. Aquileiens.* p. 155, &c., maintains that the first society of monks was collected at Aquileia. None of these writers adduces unexceptionable proof. The first convent of nuns was erected at Verona, near the close of this century, and by *Zeno* the bishop of Verona; if we may give credit to the brothers *Ballerini*, in their *Diss. ii. ad Zenonem Veronens.*, p. 115, &c.

(26) See *Sulpitius Severus*, de *Vita Martini*, cap. x., p. 17, ed. Veron., where the mode of life adopted by these Martinian monks is particularly described. See also the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 42, and others.

(27) This difference between the Oriental and the occidental monks, as to their mode of living, and the cause of it, are pleasantly noticed by *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, c. 2, p. 65, ed. Verona. *Sulpitius*, one of the interlocutors, having described the dry and sparing diet of the Egyptian monks, turned to his Gallic friend, and said: "How would you like a bunch of herbs and half a loaf, as a dinner for five men?" The Gaul, reddening a little on being so rallied, replied: "You are at your old practice, *Sulpitius*, for you neglect no opportunity that occurs, to tax us [Gallic monks] with voracity. But it is cruel in you, to require us Gauls to live in the manner of angels.—But let that Cyrenian [monk] content himself with such a dinner, since it is his necessity or nature to go hungry.—We, as I have often told you, are Gauls." In the same dialogue, cap. 4, p. 69, 70, he taxes *Jerome* with accusing the monks of

edacity, and goes on to say: "I perceive that he refers rather to the Oriental monks, than to the occidental; for edacity in the Greeks [and Orientals] is gluttony; in the Gauls it is nature." Immediately, therefore, on the introduction of the monastic institution into Europe, the occidental monks differed widely from the Oriental in their customs and mode of living, and were taxed by them with voraciousness and gluttony.

(28) [The word *monk*, (*μοναχός*, from *μονάξεν*, to live alone), first occurs in the fourth century; and has some similarity with *ascetic* [*ἀσκητής*, from *ἀσκέω*, to practise, to exercise.] At least, the monks were also called *ascetics*; though all ascetics were not monks: for the name *ascetic* denotes a Christian who devotes himself to severe religious exercises, and particularly to abstinence and fasting. Such ascetics have always existed among Christians; but these were not always monks. The word *ascetic* is a generic term; the word *monk* denotes a species under that genus. This is conceded by the Catholics, *Valesius* (notes on *Euseb.*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. xi., c. 17, and de *Martyr. Palaest.*, c. 11), and by *Pagi*, *Critica* in *Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 62, § 4, tom. i., p. 48.—The males among the monks were called *Nonni*, and the females *Nonnae*. See *Jerome*, *Ep.* 18, ad *Eustoch.*, *Opp.*, tom. iv., pt. ii., p. 34, ed. *Martianay*. *Erasmus* derives the term *nonnus* from the Egyptian language: *Gerh. Jo. Vossius* derives it from the Hebrew נון, a son; de *Vitiis Sermomis*, l. i., c. 6, p. 9, l. ii., c. 13, de *Orig. Idolol.*, l. i., c. 24.—*Schl.*]

(29) [The *coenobites* derived their name

ter, the Eremites, led a cheerless, solitary life, in certain parts of the country, dwelling in hovels among the wild beasts.(30) Still more austere than the Eremites, were those who were called *Anchorites*. These lived in desert places, with no kind of shelter; fed on roots and plants; and had no fixed residence, but lodged wherever night overtook them, so that visitors might not know where to find them.(31) The last class of monks were the *Vagrants*, called by the Egyptians *Sarabaitae*, who roamed about the provinces, and from city to city, and got their living without labour, by pretended miracles, by trafficking in relics, and by other impositions.(32) Among the *Coenobites*, many were vicious and profligate; but not so many as among the *Sarabaites*, most of whom were knaves and villains. Of the *Eremites*, the greater part were delirious fanatics, who were not in their right mind.(33) All these monks were hitherto *laymen*, or separate from the clerical order, and under the care and protection of the bishops. But many of them were now admitted into the rank of *clergymen*, even by the command of the emperors; and so great was their reputation for sanctity, that bishops were often chosen from among them.(34)

§ 16. To these defects in the moral system of the age, must be added two principal errors now wellnigh publicly adopted, and from which afterwards immense evils resulted. The first was, that to *deceive and lie, is a virtue*, when religion can be promoted by it. The other was, that *errors in religion*, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, ought to be visited with *penalties and punishments*. The first of these

from [κοινόβιον] *coenobium*, (κοινός βίος), a habitation in which several monks lived together. The ancients discriminated between a *coenobium* and a *monastery*. The latter was the residence of proper and solitary monks; the former, of associated monks, who lived together in a society. The habitation of a single, solitary monk, might be called a *monastery*, but not a *coenobium*. See *Cassianus*, Collat. xviii., c. 10, Opp., p. 525, and compare *Jerome*, Ep. 95, ad Rusticum monachum, Opp., tom., iv., pt. ii., p. 775, and *Gregory Naz.*, Orat. xxi., Opp., tom. i., p. 384.—The *nuns* also had their presidents, who were called *Mothers*. See *Jerome*, Ep. 20, Opp., tom. iv., pt. ii., p. 51. See also *Bingham*. *Origines Ecclesiast.*, vol. iii., p. 63.—*Schl.*]

(30) [From a passage in the beginning of the *Historia Lausiaca* of *Palladius*, it may be inferred, that in the most ancient times, the *eremites* and the *anchorites* were the same; for he speaks of the ἀναχωρητῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. But subsequently, a distinction was made between them.—*Schl.* The terms *monks*, *eremites*, and *anchorites* or *anachorites*, were at first, all used as synonymous; and were applied indiscriminately to those Egyptian *ascetics*, who ἀναχώρησαν retired from the world, and lived solitary μοναχοῖ (from μόνος, *alone*) in the wilderness ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, for the sake of practising (ἀσκεῖν) their religious exercises without inter-

ruption. The words *ascetic* and *monk* continued to be generic; and were applied to all, who devoted themselves to a religious life, and subjected themselves to strict rules of living. The other terms acquired more appropriate significations, when the monks became distributed into various classes or sorts.—*Tr.*]

(31) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, c. ix., p. 80, &c., ed. Verona. [When several *anchorites* lived in the same wilderness, only a little separated from each other, they were collectively called a *Laura*. See *Eragrius*, *Historia Eccles.*, l. i., c. 21, and *Valesius*, note on the passage. See also *Waleh's Hist. Eccles. N. T.*, p. 1670.—*Schl.*]

(32) [Concerning the *Sarabaites*, see *Jo. Cassianus*, Collat. xviii., c. 7, Opp., p. 731, &c., and the notes of *Gazaenus*, there.—*Tr.*]

(33) On the vices of the monks of this century, see *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, cap. iv., p. 69, 70, cap. xiv., p. 88, where he chastises in particular, the pride of those who coveted the honours of clergymen. Dial. ii., c. viii., p. 112; Dial. iii., c. xv., p. 144, 145; also the Consultatio Apollonii et Zachaci, published by *Lu. Dachery*, in *Spicileg.*, tom. i., l. iii., c. 3, p. 35, &c.

(34) See *Ja. Gothofred*, on the *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., pt. i., p. 76, 106, ed. Ritter.

principles had been approved in the preceding centuries ; and it is almost incredible, what a mass of the most insipid fables, and what a host of pious falsehoods have, through all the centuries, grown out of it, to the great detriment of true religion. If some inquisitive person were to examine the conduct and the writings of the greatest and most pious teachers of this century, I fear, he would find about all of them infected with this leprosy. I cannot except *Ambrose*, nor *Hilary*, nor *Augustine*, nor *Gregory Naz.*, nor *Jerome*. And perhaps it was this same fault that led *Sulpitius Severus*, who was in other respects no incompetent historian, to ascribe so many miracles to *St. Martin*. The other principle, from the very time when *Constantine* gave peace and security to the Christians, was approved by many ; and in the conflicts with the Priscillianists and Donatists, it was corroborated by examples, and unequivocally sanctioned by the authority of *Augustine*, and transmitted down to succeeding ages.

§ 17. If we look at the lives and morals of Christians, we shall find, as heretofore, that good men were commingled with bad ; yet the number of the bad began gradually to increase, so that the truly pious and godly appeared more rare. When there was no more to fear from enemies without, when the character of most bishops was tarnished with arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, resentments, and other defects ; when the lower clergy neglected their proper duties, and were more attentive to idle controversies, than to the promotion of piety and the instruction of the people ; when vast numbers were induced, not by a rational conviction, but by the fear of punishment and the hope of worldly advantage to enrol themselves as Christians ; how can it surprise us, that on all sides the vicious appeared a host, and the pious, a little band almost overpowered by them ? Against the flagitious and those guilty of heinous offences, the same rules for penance were prescribed, as before the reign of *Constantine*. But as the times continually waxed worse and worse, the more honourable and powerful could sin with impunity, and only the poor and the unfortunate felt the severity of the laws.

§ 18. This century was fruitful in controversies among Christians ; for as is common with mankind, external peace made room for internal discords and contentions. We shall here mention the more considerable ones, which did not give rise to obstinate heresies. In Egypt, soon after the century began or about the year 306, commenced the long-continued schism, which from the author of it was called the *Meletian* controversy. *Peter*, the bishop of Alexandria, deposed *Meletius* the bishop of Lycopolis in Thebais. The cause is involved in uncertainty. The friends of *Peter* represent *Meletius* as one who had sacrificed to the gods, and had committed other crimes.(35) Others say, he was guilty of no offence, but that of excessive severity against the lapsed.(36) *Meletius* disregarded the sentence of *Peter*, and not only continued to exercise the functions of his office, but assumed to himself the power of consecrating presbyters ; a right which, according to established usage in Egypt, belonged exclusively to the bishop of Alexandria. The partisans of this energetic and eloquent man were numerous, and at length not a few of the monks espoused

(35) *Athanasius*, *Apologia secunda*, Opp., note on *Epiphan.*, tom. ii., p. 274 ; and *Sam. Basnage*, *Exercitatio de Rebus sacris contra*

(36) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres. lxxviii.*, Opp., *Baronium*, p. 305, &c.
tom. i., p. 716, &c. See *Dion. Petavius*,

his cause. The Nicene council attempted in vain to heal this breach. The *Meletians* on the contrary, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority claimed by the bishop of Alexandria, afterwards joined themselves to his great enemies, namely the Arians. Thus a contest which at first related only to the limits of the Alexandrine bishop's powers, became, through the influence of heated passions, a controversy respecting an article of faith. The Meletian party was still existing in the fifth century. (37)

(37) [Two widely different accounts of the origin and cause of the Meletian schism have reached us. The one is from the pen of *Athanasius*, their avowed foe; the other is from *Epiphanius*, the historian of the early heresies. The Romish writers prefer the statement of Athanasius; but the most learned Protestant writers of late, generally follow Epiphanius. (See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzeren*, vol. iv., p. 355-410. *Henke*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i., p. 196, &c. *Schrocekh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. v., p. 265-273. *Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. ii., pt. i., p. 463-471, and *Gieseler's* Text-book, translated by Cunningham, vol. i., p. 166.) The statement of *Athanasius*, (Apolog. ad Imperat. Constantinum, Opp., tom. i., p. 777, ed. Colon., 1686), is as follows: *Peter, a bishop among us before the persecution, and an acknowledged martyr in it, deposed in a common council of bishops an Egyptian bishop called Meletius, who stood convicted of many crimes, and especially of sacrificing to idols. Meletius did not appeal to another council, nor endeavour to purge himself before Peter's successors, but created a schism, and his followers, instead of being called Christians, are called Meletians to this day. He at once began to utter reproaches against the bishops, and first he calumniated Peter, then his successor Achilles, and after him Alexander; and he did this with craftiness after the example of Absalom, that by calumniating the innocent he might hide the shame of his own deposition.* Such is the invective of their avowed adversary. On the contrary *Epiphanius*, who spent several years in Egypt, some of them probably in the lifetime of Meletius, and certainly while the schism excited great attention, and who passed the rest of his life in the neighbourhood of Egypt, and had constant communication with it, gives us a full and apparently very candid history of the schism, which is too long to be transcribed, but which is substantially as follows. (Hæc. 68, Opp., tom. i., p. 716, seq., ed. Petav. Colon.) During the persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, Peter the archbp. of Alexandria, and *Meletius* an eminent bp. in Thebais, (who ranked next to Peter in the archiepiscopate, and under him managed ecclesiastical affairs), and many others, were imprisoned by the gov-

ernors of the country. When they had been long in custody, and several had suffered martyrdom, while others had yielded to their fears and saved themselves by sacrificing to idols, these principal bishops were continued in prison, being reserved for the last victims. The lapsed, some of whom were soldiers and others clergymen of different orders, became anxious for reconciliation to the church; and they besought the confessors who were still in prison to interpose their authority. Disagreement and warm debate arose among these confessors. *Meletius* and others held, that the lapsed ought to be excluded from the church till the end of the persecution, and afterwards if they appeared worthy, to be admitted to penances proportionate to their offences. But *Peter* maintained that it was not advisable to wait for the end of the persecution, and that the repentant should at once be admitted to suitable penances and so be restored. Both parties showed themselves to be influenced by laudable motives; the one by love of the truth and religious zeal, the other by compassion and sympathy. At length, *Peter* finding his compassionate measures balked by the excessive zeal of *Meletius* and the others, hung out his mantle in the midst of the prison for a standard, and made proclamation, that such as agreed with him should assemble around it, and that such as agreed with Meletius should repair to him. Hereupon the mass of the bishops, monks, and presbyters gathered around Meletius, and only a very few repaired to the standard of Peter. From this time the two parties worshipped separately, and the schism became complete in the prison. (This was in the year 306, according to Baronius, *Annales*, ann. 306, n. 44; or in the year 301, according to *Pagi*, *Critica Baron.*, ann. 306, n. 29.) *Peter* afterwards suffered martyrdom; but *Meletius* and others were transported from place to place, sometimes shut up in the mines, and sometimes banished to distant regions; and everywhere Meletius spread his principles, ordained bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and erected separate churches, his followers having no communion with the others. Peter's successors retained the ancient churches, which were called the churches of the Catholics, while the new

§ 19. Not long after Meletius, one *Eustathius* excited great commotion in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighbouring countries, and was there-

churches erected by the Meletians bore the title of the martyrs' churches.—According to this account of the origin of the schism, the only crime of *Meletius* was, that he erected separate churches, and ordained bishops and curates over them, not subject to the abp. of Alexandria and not holding communion with the Catholics. Nor is any other crime alleged against him by the council of Nice which censured him, nor by the four bishops and martyrs (Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodorus, and Phileas), who remonstrated with him for his conduct. (See their letter in *Maffei Osservazioni Letterarie*, tom. iii., Verona, 1738; comp. *Euseb.*, H. E., lib. viii., c. 13.) What therefore *Athanasius* charges upon him as his greatest offence, and that for which especially Peter deposed him, namely, that he offered sacrifices to idols, is not only inconsistent with the explicit statement of *Epiphanius*, that Meletius was a confessor in bonds at the time the schism commenced, and for a long time both before and after; but is also highly improbable, not to say impossible, from the fact that the Meletian party owed its existence to its peculiar rigour against the lapsed; for such a party cannot be supposed to have been formed and guided from its commencement by the most notorious of all the lapsed, and one already deposed for this very crime. While they separated from the Catholic church as being impure, because it tolerated lapsed Christians, could they have a lapsed bishop for their founder and leader, and so admire and honour him as to call themselves after his name! or would such a bishop wish to get up a sect to bear testimony against his own sin and shame? It is incredible. And as this is the only crime which *Athanasius* specifies, we may suppose that the many crimes besides this, which he does not specify, were no other than the numerous ordinations and establishment of churches above stated. That *Meletius* was entirely sound in the faith, or was never at any time chargeable with any heresy, is stated repeatedly and explicitly by *Epiphanius*.—As this schism withdrew a large number of bishops and churches from the jurisdiction of the Egyptian primate, and greatly curtailed his power, Peter and his successors regarded it as a sore evil; and the pious generally must have been pained to see such divisions and strife among Christians. The subject was therefore brought before the council of Nice in 325. And that assembly decreed that the abp. of Alexandria should have jurisdiction, as formerly, over all the churches and clergy in Egypt, Libya,

and Pentapolis; that *Meletius* should retain the rank and honours of a bishop, but without the power of ordaining, and that he should perform no episcopal functions whatever out of his own diocese; and that those whom he had ordained should take rank after such as had been ordained by the archbishop, and might succeed them only on being duly elected and confirmed by the primate. (See the letter of the council to the African clergy, in *Socrates*, H. E., lib. i., c. 9.)—On the return of abp. Alexander from the council, he demanded of Meletius a list of all the bishops he had ordained anywhere, and also of the presbyters and deacons whom he had ordained in Alexandria and its suburbs. The object of the abp. was, to be able to detect any future ordinations by Meletius. Such a list was readily given; and it embraced the names of 28 bishops with their places of residence, and 4 presbyters and 5 deacons at Alexandria. (*Athanasius*, Apolog. ad Imp. Constantinum, Opp., t. i., p. 788–9.) From this we may form some idea of the extent of the Meletian schism; for *Athanasius* says, (*ibid.*, p. 788), that there were in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, nearly 100 bishops in his communion. And if Meletius and 23 others were schismatics, they must have constituted almost one fourth part of all the bishops. But after the council of Nice, several submitted to the archbishop, so that the number probably diminished.—*Meletius* did not long survive his censure; and after his death, Alexander resorted to coercive measures in order to bring the Meletians to submission. This induced them to despatch *Paphnutius*, a celebrated anchorite and saint, *John*, their chief bishop, a very venerable man, *Callimicus*, a bishop in Pelusium, with some others of their number, as envoys to the emperor Constantine to supplicate the protection of the government. But the officers of the palace, who knew nothing of the Meletian sect, refused the envoys all access to the emperor. After waiting some time, they applied to *Eusebius* bp. of Nicomedia, who promised to assist them, provided they would associate freely with *Arius*, who had just given a specious statement of his faith. They consented; and by the assistance of *Eusebius* they obtained from the emperor the privileges of a tolerated sect whom none were to molest. But the Meletians were thus brought into an alliance with the Arians, and of course became involved in their contests, and shared in their odium. It happened to them, says *Epiphanius*, according to the proverb: *In flying from the smoke, they fell*

fore condemned in the council of *Gangra*, which was held not long after the Nicene council. Whether this man was *Eustathius*, the bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, who was the coryphæus of the Semiarians, or whether the ancients confounded two persons of the same name, is debated with about equal weight of argument on both sides.(38) The founder of the Eustathian sect is charged, not so much with unsoundness in the faith, as with unreasonable practical notions. For he is said to have prohibited marriage, the use of flesh and wine, love-feasts, &c., and to have recommended immediate divorce to all married persons, and to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating commands of their parents and masters, under pretext of religion.(39)

§ 20. *Lucifer*, bishop of *Cagliari* in Sardinia, a man of decision, sternness, and vigour, who was driven into exile by the emperor *Constantine* for defending the Nicene doctrine of three persons in one God, first separated from *Eusebius* of Vercelli, in the year 363, because the latter was displeased that the former had consecrated *Paulinus* bishop of the church of Antioch; and he afterwards separated himself from the communion of the whole church, because it had decreed that absolution might be granted to

into the fire. And from that time onward, by associating with the Arians, many of them embraced the sentiments of Arius. (See *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 68, and *Sozomen*, *H. E.*, lib. ii., c. 21.) On the death of abp. Alexander, (A.D. 326) the Meletians elected one *Theonas* to succeed him. But *Theonas* died three months after, and *Athanasius* took quiet possession of the chair. During half a century he was in open war with the Arians and Meletians, who combined against him, and were a chief cause of his frequent and long banishments, and of all the vexations he endured. (*Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 68. *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. ii., c. 22, 23.) —*Tr*]

(38) See *Sam. Basnagc*, *Annales Politico-Ecclesiast.*, tom. ii., p. 840, &c.

(39) *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. 43. *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iii., c. 14, l. iv., c. 24. *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* lxvi., p. 910. *Philostorgius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. iii., c. 16. *Wolffg. Gundling*, *Notæ ad Concilium Gangrense*, p. 9, &c.—[The younger *Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 536–577, has treated circumstantially and solidly concerning the Eustathians. See also his *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 216, &c. The chief sources for a history of the Eustathians, are the documents of the council of *Gangra*, consisting of a synodical epistle and 20 canons. From these sources both *Socrates* and *Sozomen* derived their information. The author of the *Life of St. Basil*, which is prefixed to the third vol. of the works of *Basil*, maintains, (ch. 5, § 4, &c.), that the founder of this party was not *Eustathius*, but rather *Ærius*; and that of course the persons with whom the council of *Gan-*

gra had to do, should not be called *Eustathians*, but *Ærians*. But his arguments are not so powerful as to compel a reflecting reader to abandon the common opinion. Whether the bishop of *Sebaste* in Armenia, who is so famous in the history of the Arian heresy, and who had some connexion with *Ærius*, or another *Eustathius*, was the author of this controversy, cannot be determined with certainty. Yet the arguments for the first supposition seem to preponderate. This *Eustathius* was a pupil of *Ærius*, and a lover of monkery. Many different councils passed their judgment on him, some putting him down, and others regarding him as a valuable man. He has been accused of instability in his belief; but he seems properly to have been a Semiarian. His character is described to us by some impartial writers, as being very commendable. The synodical epistle of the council of *Gangra* is addressed to the bishops of Armenia, and censures various faults, which for the most part relate to monkish usages: and the canons enjoin the opposite of the new regulations. The *Eustathians* so abhorred matrimony as to maintain that a married lady, though pious, could not be saved if she continued to cohabit with her husband. They forbid eating flesh, or receiving the holy supper from a married priest, on pain of forfeiting salvation. They contemned the buildings erected for public worship, and held their meetings in private. They allowed a woman to forsake her husband, parents their children, and children their parents, on pretence of devoting themselves to a stricter mode of life, &c.—*Schl.*]

those bishops who under *Constantius* had deserted to the Arians.(40) At

(40) *Rufinus*, Hist. Eccles., lib. i., c. 30. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 9. See also *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tome vii., p. 521, ed. Paris : —[and, above all others, *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii., p. 338–377. From him, we shall enlarge the account given by Dr. *Mosheim*. When the orthodox party, under *Constantius*, and after the to them adverse result of the council of Arles, found themselves in great danger, and were deliberating about requesting the emperor to summon a new council, *Lucifer* proceeded to Rome, and being constituted envoy of the Romish bishop *Liberius*, he thence repaired to the imperial court in Gaul, and obtained of the emperor the council of Milan; by which however the emperor intended to further his own purposes. And as *Lucifer* was one of those who in that council zealously espoused the cause of the orthodox, he fell under the emperor's displeasure, and was sent among others into banishment. When the death of the emperor left him at liberty to return from exile, he became involved in the Meletian controversy at Antioch, and this occasioned his falling out with *Eusebius* bishop of Vercelli. For he brought forward and consecrated the aged *Paulinus* as bp. of Antioch; which *Eusebius* greatly disapproved, because, according to the decrees of the council held at Alexandria by *Athanasius*, he with *Lucifer* were commissioned to heal the divisions at Antioch, which were now widened still farther by the unwise step of *Lucifer*. The same council had also decreed that the Arian bishops, and still more those who had only held communion with such bishops, might, after acceding to the Nicene creed, be received into the church and remain in their offices. The refusal of *Eusebius* to approve of his proceedings at Antioch, and the mild regulations of the Alexandrian council respecting those whom *Lucifer* accounted apostate bishops, which he could by no means approve, induced him to break off all church communion with such as approved those regulations; and thence arose the schism which bears his name. After this separation he continued to exercise his functions at Cagliari for nine years, and at last died at an advanced age.—*Schl.* See, for account of his writings, note, p. 257.

The following more full account of the Meletian controversy at Antioch, is given by *Schlegel* from Dr. *Walch's* Hist. der Ketzereyen.—After the council of Nice, *Eustathius* bishop of Antioch very strenuously opposed the progress of Arian doctrines, and was therefore deprived of his office, and

another was elected in his place who was more favourable to the Arians, and after him succeeded others, all holding Arian sentiments. The last of these was *Eudoxius*, who was removed to Constantinople on the deposition of *Macedonius* bp. of that city, (A.D. 360). *Meletius* of Syria, was now chosen bishop of Antioch by a council. He had before been bishop of Sebaste, and the heads of the Arian party supposed him to hold the Arian sentiments. He at least held communion with Arians, and had by his virtuous life obtained a high reputation. At first *Meletius* concealed his sentiments, and in his public discourses treated only on practical subjects. But as one part of his hearers were orthodox, and the other part Arians, he did not long leave them in uncertainty, but acknowledged to them his conviction of the correctness of the Nicene faith. This acknowledgment was the source of much suffering to *Meletius*. The Arians resented it very highly, that he should disappoint their expectations; and as he would not retract, they deprived him of his office A.D. 362, by the aid of the emperor *Constantius*, and banished him from the country. *Meletius* now left Antioch and went to his native city Melitene. In his place, *Euzoïus* one of the oldest friends of Arius, was appointed. But the orthodox, who would not acknowledge him as a bishop, now wholly ceased to worship with the Arians, which they had done up to this time. Thus there were now three parties at Antioch. The Arians who acknowledged *Euzoïus* for their bishop; the *Eustathians*, who, ever since the deposition of *Eustathius* (A.D. 327), whom they regarded as the legitimate bishop of Antioch, had ceased to worship with the Arians, and held their separate meetings without making disturbance; and the *Meletians*, who were the majority, and who acknowledged *Meletius* for the legitimate bishop. The Meletians were willing to unite with the Eustathians, on condition that they would look upon *Meletius* as themselves did. But the Eustathians refused to do so, and would not acknowledge the Meletians for brethren, because they considered both them and their bishop as not pure enough from the Arian infection. *Athanasius*, *Eusebius* of Vercelli, and *Lucifer* attempted to reconcile these divisions. *Lucifer* afterwards (A.D. 362) consecrated a new bishop of Antioch; whom however the Eustathians only would receive. *Meletius* now came back to Antioch; and thus there were two orthodox bishops of Antioch, *Paulinus* (the Eustathian bishop), and *Meletius*; and the difficulties

least this is certain, that the little company of his followers, or the *Luciferians*, would have no intercourse with the bishops who joined themselves to the Arian sect, nor with those who had absolved these bishops after confessing their fault; and thus they renounced the whole church.(41) They are likewise reported to have held erroneous sentiments respecting the human soul, viewing it as generated from the bodies of the parents, or as transfused by the parents into their children.(42)

§ 21. About the same time, or not much after, *Aërius*, a presbyter, monk, and Semiarian, rent Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, by opinions wide of those commonly received, and thus founded a sect. First he maintained that (*jure divino*), by divine appointment, there was no difference between bishops and presbyters. Yet it is not very clear, how far he carried this sentiment, though it is certain that it was very pleasing to many, who were disgusted with the pride and arrogance of the bishops of that age. In the next place, *Aërius* disapproved of prayers for the dead, the stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other things which most persons regarded as the very soul of religion.(43) He seems to have aimed to re-

were increased rather than settled by the procedure of *Lucifer*. The foreign bishops took part in this controversy. *Athanasius* looked on *Paulinus* as the most orthodox, and therefore he and the greater part of the West, with the Island of Cyprus, took the side of *Paulinus*. The eastern bishops were on the side of *Meletius*; who was exiled by the emperor *Valens*, but returned after that emperor's death, and suddenly died, (A.D. 381). The Greek and the Latin churches enrolled him among the saints, after his death. As respects the Latin church, this was a very extraordinary transaction. *Meletius* died entirely out of communion with the Romish see; and yet he is numbered among their saints! Either the pope then must be not infallible, or the Romish church worships as saints, persons who, according to her own principles, are unworthy of worship. The death of *Meletius* did not restore peace at Antioch. The *Meletians*, instead of acknowledging *Paulinus* for a legitimate bishop, elected *Flavianus*, an orthodox and irreproachable character, for a successor to *Meletius*. This *Flavianus* was supported by the bishops of Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, the lesser Asia, and Thrace; on the side of *Paulinus* were the bishops of Rome and Italy, and of Egypt and Arabia, who wished for the deposition of *Flavianus*. *Paulinus* died (in 389); but instead of giving peace to the church, influenced probably by a fanatical obstinacy, he before his death consecrated over his little party one *Eragrius* as his successor. Soon after, (A.D. 393), *Eragrius* died: but the disunion still continued. Finally, through the prudence and the pacific temper of *Chrysostom*, peace and ecclesiastical communion between the two parties were re-

stored. *Flavianus* was acknowledged by the foreign bishops as the bishop of Antioch. Yet there remained a little handful of *Eustathians*, who did not unite with the general church till *Flavianus* was succeeded by other bishops. See *Walch*, *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iv., p. 410–502.—*Schl.*]

(41) See the petition addressed to Theodosius by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, two *Luciferians*; in the Works of *Is. Sirmond*, tom. ii., p. 229, &c.

(42) See *Augustine*, de *Hæres.*, c. 81; and on that passage, *Lamb. Danæus*, p. 346. [This account is very uncertain; and *Augustine* himself does not state it as a matter of certainty. See *Walch*, l. c., p. 368.—*Schl.*]

(43) *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxxv., p. 905, &c. *Augustine*, de *Haeres.*, c. 53, and some others. [The last is not a witness of much weight. He had no acquaintance with the *Aërians*, but took one part of his statement from *Epiphanius*, (ubi supra), and the other from *Philastrius*, de *Haeres.*, c. 72, p. 140. *Epiphanius* had it in his power to get, and did get, better information respecting the Oriental controversies than *Philastrius* could. The latter speaks of *Aërius*, as of one unknown to him; the former, as of one whose history he well knew, and who was then alive. *Epiphanius* knew the *Encratites* very well, and he distinguishes them from the *Aërians*; but *Philastrius* confounds them. *Aërius* was a native of Pontus, or of the lesser Armenia, an eloquent man, and a friend of the well-known Semiarian *Eustathius*, afterwards bishop of Sebaste, with whom he lived at the same time among the monks. The elevation of *Eustathius* to the see of Sebaste, first awakened envy in *Aërius*, he having himself aspired after that

duce religion to its primitive simplicity, a design which in itself considered was laudable, though in the motives and the mode of proceeding there were perhaps some things censurable.

§ 22. There were various persons of this sort in the fourth century, who were disgusted with the progress of superstition and of errors respecting the true nature of religion, and who opposed the general current; but the only fruit of their labour, was, that they were branded with infamy. Eminent among them was *Jovinian*, an Italian monk, who taught first at Rome and then at Milan, near the close of the century, and persuaded many, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven; and consequently, that those who spend their lives in celibacy or macerate their bodies by fasting, are no more acceptable to God, than those who live in wedlock, and nourish their bodies with moderation and sobriety. These sentiments were first condemned by the church of Rome, and then by *Ambrose* in a council held at Milan in the year 390.(44) The emperor *Honorius* enacted penal laws against persons holding such sentiments, and *Jovinian* he banished to the island Boa.(45) *Jovinian* pub-

promotion. To allay that feeling, *Eustathius* made his friend a presbyter, and committed to his care the superintendence of a house for the reception of strangers. But the good understanding between them was of short continuance. *Ærius* could be restrained by nothing from his restless conduct towards his bishop, whom he accused of avarice and misappropriation of the funds for the poor. At last they came to a breach. *Ærius* abandoned his office and his hospital, and acquired many adherents; who however nowhere found indulgence, as the disposition to persecute was then almost universal among the clergy. *Ærius* maintained, that in the times of the apostles, there was no difference between a bishop and a presbyter; and this he solidly proved from passages in Paul. He was not disposed to abolish the human rights of bishops, but only to rescue the presbyters from episcopal oppression in the exercise of their legitimate functions. He held the prayers and the alms of the living for the dead, to be useless and dangerous; and discarded the regular, prescribed Christian fasts on certain days. The festival of Easter he did not wholly discard, as it is commonly supposed, but only the ceremony of slaying a lamb at Easter, which according to ancient custom was practised by some Christians. This appears from the argument by which he supported his opinion. For he says: "Christians should keep no *Passover*, because Paul declares *Christ*, slain for us, to be our *Paschal Lamb*." This reasoning would be insipid, if *Ærius* proposed by it to put down altogether the whole festival of Easter. *Ærius* was therefore in the right, and his opposers in the wrong. Only his obstinacy in pushing matters to a schism, is

blameable. See the younger *Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 321–338.—*Schl.*]

(44) *Hieronymus*, in *Jovinianum*, Opp., tom. ii. *Augustine*, de *Haeres.*, c. 82. *Ambrose*, Ep. vi., &c. [*Jovinian* lived at Rome, when he advanced the doctrines which were so strenuously opposed. Yet it is uncertain, whether Rome or Milan was his native place. He was not unlearned, and he lived a single life. To the preceding doctrines of *Jovinian*, the following may be added. That *Mary* ceased to be a virgin by bringing forth *Christ*, which some denied:—that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works;—and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, can not sin wilfully, but will so resist the temptations of the devil as not to be overcome by him. For these doctrines, *Jovinian* was accused by some Christians at Rome before *Siricius* the Roman bishop. A council was assembled by *Siricius*, by which *Jovinian* was condemned and excommunicated. He then retired with his friends to Milan. There they were condemned by a council which *Ambrose* assembled. By such persecution, the party was soon crushed. See *Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 635–682.—*Schl.*]

(45) *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. iii., p. 218. tom. vi., p. 193.—[This law is dated in the year 412. But according to the representation of *Jerome*, *Jovinian* must, in the year 406, have been dead some considerable time. The law therefore must either have been aimed against altogether a different person—and there appear in it no traces of the complaints brought against *Jovinian*—or the date of it must be erroneous, as was con-

lished his opinions in a book, against which *Jerome* in the following century wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, which is still extant.

§ 23. Of all the religious controversies [among the orthodox], those concerning *Origen* made the greatest noise and continued the longest. Though *Origen* had long been accused of many errors, yet hitherto most Christians had regarded his name with veneration. But now the Arians, cunningly looking on every side for support, maintained that this great man had been of their party. Some believed them, and therefore indulged the same hatred towards *Origen*, as towards the Arians. Yet some of the most eminent and best informed men resisted the charge, and strove to vindicate the reputation of their master against these aspersions. Among these *Eusebius*, bishop of Cæsarea, stood pre-eminent, in consequence of his written *Apology for Origen*. And I believe, this storm raised against the honour of a man to whom the whole Christian world paid respect, would have soon subsided, if new commotions had not arisen, which proceeded from another source.

§ 24. All the monks, and especially those of Egypt, were enthusiastic admirers of *Origen*; and they spared no pains to disseminate everywhere the opinions which they imbibed from him. Yet they could not persuade all to believe that those opinions were sound and correct. Hence first appeared a kind of smothered disagreement respecting the character of *Origen's* doctrines, which advanced gradually till it became an open flame. Among many others, *John* the bishop of Jerusalem was in favour of *Origen*; and as *Epiphanius* and *Jerome* were from other causes hostile to *John*, they endeavoured to excite odium against him on this ground. He defended himself in such a way, as to protect the reputation of *Origen*, and at the same time to have the whole swarm of monks and innumerable others on his side. From this beginning, arose those vehement contests respecting the doctrines of *Origen*, which pervaded both the East and the West. In the West they were fomented especially by *Rufinus*, a presbyter of Aquileia, who translated some of *Origen's* books into Latin, and who showed not obscurely that he was pleased with the sentiments those books contained. (46) He therefore now incurred the implacable wrath of *Jerome*. But at length, *Rufinus* being dead, and men of high reputation in the West opposing the progress of Origenism both by their influence and their writings, these commotions seemed to subside in the West.

§ 25. In the East, far greater troubles came upon the church on account of Origenism. *Theophilus* bishop of Alexandria, who was for various reasons hostile to some of the monks of Scetys and Nitria, taxed them with their Origenism, and ordered them to throw away the books of *Origen*. The monks resisted his command, alleging sometimes that the objec-

jectured by *Tillemont*, tome x., p. 229, 753. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 364, &c.—*Schl.* *Jovinian* was condemned at Rome and Milan, about the year 388, and with him these eight persons, *Auxentius*, *Genialis*, *Geminator*, *Felix*, *Protinus*, *Martianus*, *Januarius*, and *Ingeniosus*. About the year 396, *Sarmatio* and *Barbati-anus*, two monks of Milan, advanced similar doctrines at Vercellæ, (*Ambrose*, Ep. 63, [al. 82, al. 25], ad Vercellensem ecclesiam).

About the year 404, *Vigiliantius*, a presbyter of Barcelona, appeared a still more famous reformer. See below, cent. v., pt. ii., ch. iii., § 14, p. 348, and *Gieseler's* Text-book, tr. by Cunningham, vol. i., p. 310.—*Tr.*]

(46) See especially, *Just. Fontaninus*, *Historia litteraria Aquileiensis*, lib. iv., c. 3, &c., p. 177, &c., where he gives an elaborate history of *Rufinus*.

tionable passages in the writings of that holy man were interpolations of the heretics, and sometimes that it was improper to condemn the whole together on account of a few censurable passages. *Theophilus* therefore, after condemning the Origenists in a council assembled at Alexandria, in the year 399, employed military force to drive the monks from the mountains of Nitria. They fled first to Jerusalem, and thence removed to Scythopolis; but finding themselves insecure there likewise, they set sail for Constantinople, intending to lay their cause before the imperial court. (47) The remainder of their history belongs to the next century. But it is proper to remark, that those who are denominated *Origenists* in the writings of this age, were not all of one character. For this ambiguous term sometimes denotes merely a person who was friendly to *Origen*, one who looked upon his books as corrupted, and did not defend the errors of which he was accused; but at other times it designates persons, who admitted that *Origen* taught all that he was charged with teaching, and who resolutely defended his opinions. Of this latter class were many of the monks.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1, 2. Ceremonies multiplied.—§ 3. Form of Public Worship.—§ 4. Some Parts of it changed.—§ 5. Festal Days.—§ 6. Fasts.—§ 7. Administration of Baptism.—§ 8. and of the Lord's Supper.

§ 1. WHILE the fostering care of the emperors sought to advance the Christian religion, the indiscreet piety of the bishops obscured its true nature and depressed its energies, by the multiplication of rites and ceremonies. The observation of *Augustine* is well known, That the yoke once laid upon the Jews was more supportable, than that laid on many Christians in his age. (1) For the Christian bishops introduced, with but slight alterations, into the Christian worship, those rites and institutions by which formerly the Greeks, Romans, and other nations had manifested their piety and reverence towards their imaginary deities; supposing that the people would more readily embrace Christianity, if they saw that the rites handed down to them from their fathers still existed unchanged among the Christians, and perceived that *Christ* and the martyrs were worshipped in the same manner, as formerly their gods were. There was, of course, little difference, in these times, between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both alike there were splendid

(47) See *Peter Dan. Huet*, *Origeniana*, lib. ii., cap. 4, p. 196, &c. *Ludov. Doucin*, *Histoire de l'Origenisme*, liv. iii., p. 95, &c. *Hieron. a Prato*, Diss. vi., in *Sulpitium Severum de Monachis ob Originis nomen ex Nitria totaque Aegypto pulsus*, p. 273, Veron., 1741, fol. These writers cite the ancient authorities; but they make some mistakes. [The literary history of this con-

troversy is given by the senior *Walch*, *Historia Eccles. N. T.*, p. 1042, &c.—*Schl.* The history itself, but without naming authorities, is given by *A. Neander*, in his *Chrysostomus und dessen Zeitalter*, Ifter Band, s. 163, &c.—*Tr.*]

(1) *Augustine*, *Epist.* 119, ad *Januarium*, according to the ancient division.

robes, mitres, tiaras, wax tapers, crosiers,(2) processions, lustrations, images, golden and silver vases, and numberless other things.

§ 2. No sooner had *Constantine* renounced the religion of his ancestors, than magnificent temples were everywhere erected, which were adorned with pictures and images, and which both in their external and their internal form were very similar to the fanes and the temples of the gods.(3) These temples were of two kinds. Some were erected at the graves of the *martyrs*, and were called *Martyria*: the people assembled in these only at stated times. Others were intended for the ordinary and common meetings for religious worship; and were afterwards called by the Latins *Tituli*.(4) Both were consecrated with great pomp, and with rites borrowed in great measure from the ancient pontifical code of the Romans. And what is more strange, a great part of religion was supposed to consist in the multitude of churches; and the *right of patronage*, as it is called, was introduced among Christians, for no other reason than to induce opulent persons to build churches.(5) Thus, in this particular the true religion evidently copied after superstition. For the ancient nations supposed, that a country or province would be the more prosperous and secure, the more temples, fanes, and chapels were there erected to the gods and heroes; because those gods would be ashamed not to show themselves patrons and defenders of the people who worshipped and honoured them with so much zeal. The same sentiment prevailed among the Christians. They supposed, the more temples there were dedicated to *Christ*, to his servants and his friends, the more certain they might be of assistance from *Christ* and his friends. For they supposed God, *Christ*, and the inhabitants of heaven, equally with us wretched mortals, to be delighted and captivated with external signs and expressions of respect.

§ 3. The Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, reading the holy scriptures, a discourse to the people, and then closed with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But these exercises were accompanied with various ceremonies, which were better calculated to please the eye than

(2) [The *crosier* or *bishop's staff*, was exactly of the form of the *lituus*, the chief ensign of the ancient *augurs*. See *Cicero*, de *Divinatione*, l. i., c. 17.—*Tr.*]

(3) See *Ezck. Spanheim*, *Preuves sur les Césars de Julien*, p. 47; but especially, *Peter le Brun*, *Explication litterale et histor. des ceremonies de la Messe*, tome ii., p. 101, &c. For a description of such a temple, see *Eusebius*, de *Vita Constantini Magni*, l. iii., c. 35, &c. Plates representing their interior form, are given by *Wm. Beveridge*, *Adnotatt. ad Pandectas Canonum*, tom. ii., p. 70, and by *Fred. Spanheim*, *Institutt. Hist. Eccles.*, in his *Opp.*, tom. i., p. 860. Some parts of the Christian temples were after the pattern of the Jewish temple. See *Camp. Vitringa*, de *Synagoga veteri*, lib. iii., p. 466. [Some of these temples were new buildings erected by the emperors; others were pagan temples transmuted to Christian churches. See *Codex Theodos.*, lib. ix., tit. xvii., leg. 2, and *Jerome*, *Chronicon*, ann. 332. From the Jews was borrowed,

the division into the holy of holies, the holy place, and the court; from which came the chancel, the nave, and the porch. (*ἁγία, ναὸς*, and *ναὸς*.)—*Schl.*]

(4) *Joh. Mabillon*, *Museum Italic.*, tom. ii., in *Comment. ad ordin. Roman.*, p. xvi., &c. [The *Tituli*, of the middle ages, were properly the *parish churches*, under the care of presbyters, who derived their titles from their respective churches. See *Du Cange*, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis*, voce *Titulus*.—*Tr.*]

(5) *Just. Henn. Boehmer*, *Jus Eccles. Protestant.*, tom. iii., p. 466, &c. *Bibliothèque Italique*, tome v., p. 166, &c. [Whoever erected to any god either a larger or a smaller temple, had the right of designating the priests and attendants on the altar who should officiate there. And whoever erected a Christian temple, possessed the same right in regard to those who should minister there. This induced many persons to build churches.—*Schl.*]

to excite true devotion.(6) But all congregations did not, by any means, follow one and the same rule or form. Each individual bishop according to his own views, and as the circumstances of times, places, and persons suggested, prescribed to his own flock such a form of public worship as he judged best. Hence that variety of *liturgies*, which were in use before the Roman pontiff arrogated to himself supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded people that they ought to copy after the principal church, the common mother of them all, as well in doctrine as in their modes of worship.

§ 4. It would be tedious to go over all the parts of public worship; I will therefore content myself with a few observations. The prayers lost much of their primitive simplicity and dignity, and became turgid and bombastic. Among the public hymns, the Psalms of David were now received.(7) The public discourses, among the Greeks especially, were formed according to the rules for civil eloquence, and were better adapted to call forth the admiration of the rude multitude who love display, than to amend the heart. And that no folly and no senseless custom might be omitted in their public assemblies, the people were allowed to applaud their orators, as had been practised in the forums and theatres; nay they were instructed both to applaud and to elap the preachers.(8) Who would suppose, that men professing to despise vainglory, and who were appointed to show to others the emptiness of all human things, would become so senseless?

§ 5. The *first day of the week*, (on which Christians were accustomed to meet for the worship of God.) *Constantine* required by a special law, to be observed more sacredly than before.(9) In most congregations of Christians, five annual festivals were observed; namely, in remembrance of the Saviour's *birth*, of his sufferings and *death* for the sins of men, of his *resurrection*, of his *ascension* to heaven, and of the *descent of the Holy Ghost* upon his ministers. Of these festivals, that of the fourteen days sacred to the memory of *Christ's* return to life, was observed with much more ceremony

(6) The form of public worship, or the *liturgy* of this age, may be very well learned in general from *Cyriel* of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* xxii.; and from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which are falsely ascribed to *Clemens Roman.* These writers are explained and interpreted by *Peter le Brun*, *Explication litterale et historique de la Messe*, tom. ii., p. 53, &c., which is a very learned work. [See also *Dr. Ernesti's* *Antimurator*, p. 13, &c.—*Schl*]

(7) *Beausobre*, *Histoire du Manicheisme*, tom. ii., p. 614, &c. [They were sung in course, or in their order. *Joh. Cassianus*, *Institut.*, lib. ii., c. 2, 4, lib. iii., c. 3. Yet for the public worship on certain occasions, particular Psalms were appointed; (*Augustine* on Ps. xxi.); and it lay with the bishop to designate what Psalms he would have sung. *Athanasius*, *Apolog.* ii. *Augustine* on Ps. cxxxviii.—*Schl*.]

(8) *Fran. Bernh. Ferrarius*, *de veterum acclamationibus et plausu*, p. 66.

(9) *Ja. Gothofred*, *Notes to the Codex*

Theodos., tom. i., p. 135. [See *Eusebius*, *de Vita Constantini*, lib., iv., c. 18, 19, 20, 23. *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. i., c. 8. The principal laws of *Constantine* and his successors, in regard to the Lord's day and the other festivals, are collected in the *Codex Justinianus*, lib. iii., tit. xii., leg. 1–11. The Lord's day and the other festivals were placed on the same level. On them all, the courts of justice and the public offices were to be closed, except in certain urgent cases. *Constantine*, in the year 321, required the inhabitants of cities and all mechanics to suspend their business on the Lord's day; but he allowed such as resided in the country, full liberty to pursue their agriculture, because it was supposed necessary for them to sow their fields and prop their vines when the weather and the season best suited. The emperor *Leo*, however, in the year 469, thought agriculture required no exception; and therefore he included farmers under the same prohibition with mechanics. See *Imp. Leonis Novellae Constitut.* 54.—*Tr.*]

than the rest.(10) The Oriental Christians kept the memorial of the Saviour's *birth* and of his *baptism*, on one and the same day, namely the *sixth* day of January; and this day they called *Epiphany*.(11) But the occidental Christians seem always to have consecrated the 25th of December to the memory of the Saviour's birth. For what is reported of the Roman pontiff *Julian I.* that he transferred the memorial of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December,(12) appears to me very

(10) *Gothofred*, Notes on the Codex Theodos., tom. i., p. 143.

(11) See *Beausobre*, Histoire du Manichisme, tom. ii., p. 693, &c.

(12) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. ii., p. 164. *Alph. du Vignoles*, Dissert. in the Biblioth. German., tom. ii., p. 29. [Additional remarks on the origin of the festivals.—The first Christians, being chiefly Jews who were accustomed to assemble at Jerusalem on the great festivals, found it advantageous after their conversion to continue to meet in that city on the two great feasts of the Passover and Pentecost. While thus assembled at Jerusalem, they would naturally recognise with thrilling emotions the recurring anniversaries of their Lord's crucifixion, resurrection from the dead, ascension to heaven, and sending down the H. Spirit upon them on the day of Pentecost. All these days occurred during the Jewish feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, or in the interval between them; and they answer to the festivals of *Good Friday*, *Easter Sunday*, *Ascension Day*, and *Whitsuntide*. These four days having been observed from the earliest times with peculiar interest, were at length considered as Christian festivals which apostolic usage had introduced, and they were accordingly sanctioned by the authority of general councils. And *St. Augustine* (Ep. 54, al. 118, c. i.) mentions them as the only festivals which were regarded, in his times, as having such an origin and such a sanction. He admits, indeed, that the Christians of his age observed also *Christmas* or the day of Christ's nativity as a festival, but he considers it as of later origin, and less sacred than the four above mentioned. (*Augustine*, Ep. 55, al. 119, c. i.) As *Augustine* represents Christmas as neither derived from apostolic usage nor sanctioned by any general council, *Adr. Baillet* very candidly says, (*Vies des Saints*, t. iii., p. 298), *there can be no reasonable doubt, that it had its rise after the council of Nice*. Such a conclusion is the more probable from the omission of the Antenicene fathers to speak of any such festival in the church, and from their great indifference about ascertaining the day of the Saviour's birth. The following passage from *Clemens Alex.*, (*Stromata*, l. i., p. 340, al.

249), is almost the only genuine passage of an Antenicene writer, which can be supposed to allude at all to such a festival; and as it states the different conjectures in that age respecting the day of Christ's birth, and manifests the indifference with which even the learned treated the subject, the passage is worth repeating entire. *Clement* had just given a list of all the Roman emperors till the death of *Commodus*, A.D. 192, and had stated in what years of certain emperors the Saviour was either born, or baptized, or crucified. He then says: "There are some who *over curiously* (*περὲργότερον*) assign not only the year, but also the day of our Saviour's nativity, which they say was in the 28th year of Augustus, on the (25th of Pachon) 20th of May. And the followers of *Basilides* observe also the day of his baptism as a festival, spending the whole previous night in reading; and they say, it was in the 15th year of *Tiberius Cæsar*, on the (15th of Tybi) 10th of January; but some say it was on the (11th) 6th of that month. Among those who nicely calculate the time of his passion, some say it was in the 16th year of *Tiberius Cæsar*, the (25th of Phamenoth) 22d of March; others say, the (25th of Pharmuthi) 21st of April; and others, that it was on the (19th of Pharmuthi) 15th of April, that the Saviour suffered. Nay, some of them say that he was born in (Pharmuthi) April, the (24th or 25th) 20th or 21st day." —After the establishment of Christianity by Constantine, and among the new institutions which were intended for the benefit of the church, we seem authorized to place the commemoration of Christ's advent. This the Oriental Christians generally assigned to the 6th of January, on which day they supposed both the birth and the baptism of Christ occurred, and in reference to both they called it *Epiphany*. But the western Christians observed the 25th of December as their festival of the nativity. According to an epistle of *John*, abp. of Nice, (in the Auctar. Bibl. Patr., ed. Combefis, t. ii., p. 297), and an anonymous writer cited by *Cotelierus*, (ad Constitut. Apostol., v., 13), it was *Julian I.* (bp. of Rome A.D. 337–352) who first ascertained this to be the right day: and though this authority is not the best, yet it is generally admitted that the designation of

questionable. The unlucky success of the age in finding the dead bodies of certain holy men, increased immensely the *commemoration of martyrs*. Devout men would have readily consented to the multiplication of festivals, if the time that Christians consumed in them had been employed to advance them in true holiness. But the majority spent the time rather in idleness, and dissipation, and other vices, than in the worship of God. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious by the *Vigils*, as they were called, of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, [or the *nocturnal meetings*, held on the nights preceding the *Paschal* and *Pentecostal* festivals.]

§ 6. It was believed that nothing scarcely was more effectual, to repel the assaults of evil spirits and to placate the Deity, than *fasting*. Hence it is easy to discover, why the rulers of the church ordained fasts by express laws, and commanded as a necessary duty, what was before left at discretion. The *Quadragesimal* [or *Lent*] *fast*, as it was called, was considered more sacred than all the rest; though it was not as yet fixed to a determinate number of days. (13) But it should be remembered, that the

the 25th of December for the festival, was first made about the middle of the fourth century. Afterwards the Oriental churches gradually came into the Roman custom, and most of them before the end of the century. And on the other hand, the western churches adopted the Oriental *Epiphany*, on the 6th of January, as the proper festival of Christ's baptism. The motives which led the western churches to place the festival of the nativity on the 25th of December, are not clearly ascertained. Some among the Catholics, (e. g., *John Harduin*), and many among the Protestants, (e. g., *Hospinian*, *Jablonski*, *Eisenschmid*, *Gieseler*, &c.), think that day was chosen, because it was the day on which the Romans celebrated their festival of *natatis solis invicti*, or of the sun's passing the southern solstice and beginning to return northward—a fit emblem of the approach of the Sun of Righteousness to mortals; (see the orations of *Augustine* and *Chrysostom* on the nativity of Christ): and because the establishment of a Christian festival of several days, at that season of the year, might supplant the Saturnalia and other corrupting festivals of the pagans. But other reasons may be stated. As the true day of the nativity was then unknown, and as divers hypothetical arguments were advanced which led to different conclusions, there were doubtless many persons in that age, as there are in this, who believed that the 25th of December was the most probable day. And all might have felt it desirable, to have a Christian festival at some other season of the year, than the 50 or 60 days next after the vernal equinox, into which all the older festivals were clustered.—From the first institution of this festival, the western nations seem to have transferred to it many

of the follies and censurable practices which prevailed in the pagan festivals of the same season, such as adorning the churches fantastically, mingling puppet-shows and dramas with worship, universal feasting and merrymaking, Christmas visits and salutations, Christmas presents and jocularities, and Christmas revelry and drunkenness. For from the days of Augustine and Chrysostom down to our own times, we find many devout persons deprecating the heathenish manner in which the festival was kept, and labouring to give it a more Christian character. The Christmas holidays,—which by a law of *Theodosius* the Gr., (emperor A.D. 383–395), were to comprise 14 days, or the seven days before Christmas and the seven days after, (Codex Justinian., lib. iii., tit. xii., leg. 2),—have borne so close a resemblance, wherever they have been observed, to the Roman Saturnalia, Sigillaria, &c., and to the Juel feast of the ancient Goths, as to afford strong presumption of an unhappy alliance between them from the first.—(See *Adr. Baillet*, *Vies des Saints*, Dec. 25, tom. iii., p. 295, &c. *G. B. Eisenschmid*, *Geschichte der Sonn-und Festtage*, Lips., 1793, p. 99, &c. *R. Hospinian*, *de Orig. Festor. Christ.*, ed. 1684, p. 168, &c. *A. Neander*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. i. pt. ii., p. 527, &c., and his *Chrysostomus und dessen Zeitalter*, vol. i., p. 236, &c., 259, &c., 288, &c. *M. Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. x., p. 349, &c. *J. Bingham*, *Origines Ecclesiast.*, book xx., ch. iv.)—*Tr.*]

(13) *Joh. Daillé*, *de Jejunii et Quadragesima*, lib. iv. [The Quadragesimal fast was at first of only 40 hours; afterwards, it was extended to several days, and even weeks; and at last settled at 36 days. In the Oriental churches, Lent commenced with

fasts of this age differed much from those observed by Christians in preceding ages. Anciently, those who undertook to observe a fast, abstained altogether from food and drink; in this age, many deemed it sufficient merely to omit the use of flesh and wine : (14) and this sentiment afterwards became universal among the Latins.

§ 7. For the more convenient administration of *baptism*, sacred fonts or *baptisteria* (15) were erected in the porches of the temples. This sacred rite was always administered, except in cases of necessity when the rule was dispensed with, on the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, accompanied with lighted wax candles, and by the bishop, or by the presbyters whom the bp. commissioned for that purpose. In some places, salt, a symbol of purity and wisdom, was put into the mouth of the baptized; and everywhere, a double anointing was used, the first before and the other after the baptism. After being baptized, the persons appeared clad in white gowns during seven days. The other rites, which were either of temporary duration, or confined to certain countries, are here omitted.

§ 8. The instruction and discipline of the *catechumens* were the same in this century as the preceding. That the *Lord's Supper* was administered twice or three times a week, (though in some places only on Sunday), to all who assembled for the worship of God, appears from innumerable testimonies. It was also administered at the sepulchres of the martyrs, and at funerals; whence arose, afterwards, the *masses* in honour of the saints, and for the dead. The bread and wine were now everywhere elevated, before distribution, so that they might be seen by the people, and be viewed with reverence; and hence arose, not long after, the *adoration of the symbols*. Neither *catechumens*, nor *penitents*, nor those who were supposed to be under the power of evil spirits, were allowed to be present at this sacred ordinance; nor did the sacred orators, in their public discourses, venture to speak openly and plainly concerning the true nature of it. The origin of this custom was not very honourable, as has been stated before; yet many offer an honourable excuse for it, by saying, that this concealment might awaken eagerness in the *catechumens* to penetrate early into these mysteries

the seventh week before Easter, because two days in each week they suspended the fast; but in the western churches, it commenced with the sixth week, because they fasted on the Sundays. Finally, *Gregory* the Great, in the sixth century, or as others say, *Gregory II.* in the eighth century, added four days more to this fast, so as to make it full 40 days. In the fourth century, however, the Lent fast was in a degree optional; and the people were exhorted with entreaties to its observance. See *Baumgarten's* Erläut. der christ. Alterthümer, p. 329, &c.—*Schl.*]

(14) See *Joh. Barbeyrac*, de la Morale des Peres, p. 250, &c.

(15) [The *Baptisteries* were properly *buildings adjacent* to the churches, in which the catechumens were instructed, and where were a sort of cisterns, into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion. See *Baumgarten's* Erläuterung der christlichen Alterthümer, p. 388.—*Schl.* See also *Rob. Robertson's* History of Baptism, ch. 12, p. 67-73, ed. Benedict, 1817.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE HERESIES.

§ 1. Remains of the former Sects.—§ 2, 3. Origin of the Donatist Controversy.—§ 4. History of the Donatists.—§ 5, 6. Origin of the Circumcelliones.—§ 7. State of the Donatists under the Emperors *Julian* and *Gratian*.—§ 8. Their principal Crime.—§ 9. The Doctrine of this Age concerning the sacred Trinity.—§ 10. The Rise of Arianism.—§ 11. Its Progress.—§ 12. The Nicene Council.—§ 13. History of Arianism after that Council.—§ 14. under the Sons of Constantine.—§ 15. under Julian, Jovian, &c.—§ 16. Sects among the Arians.—§ 17. Heresy of Apollinaris.—§ 18. Marcellus of Ancyra.—§ 19. Heresy of Photinus.—§ 20. That of Macedonius. The Council of Constantinople.—§ 21, 22. The Priscillianists.—§ 23. The minor Sects. Audaus.—§ 24, 25. Messalians, or Euchites.

§ 1. THE seeds and remains of those sects which were conspicuous in the preceding centuries, continued in this, especially in the East; nor did they cease to make some proselytes, notwithstanding the absurdity of their opinions. The *Manichæan* sect beyond others, and by its very turpitude, ensnared many; and often, persons of good talents also, as appears by the example of *Augustine*. This wide-spreading pestilence, the most respectable doctors of the age, and among them *Augustine* when recovered from his infatuation, made efforts to arrest; some indeed with more learning and discrimination, and others with less, but none of them without some success. But the disease could not be wholly extirpated, either by books or by severe laws,(1) but after remaining latent for a time, and when most people supposed it extinct, it would break out again with greater violence. For the Manichæans, to avoid the severity of the laws, assumed successively various names, as *Encratites*, *Apotactics*, *Saccophori*, *Hydroparastites*, *Solitarii*, &c., and under these names, they often lay concealed for a time; but not long, for the vigilance of their enemies would find them out.(2)

§ 2. But the state had little to fear from these people, whose energies were gradually impaired and oppressed in the Roman empire by penal laws and persecutions. A much more threatening storm arose in Africa, which though small in its commencement, kept both the church and the state in commotion for more than a century. *Mensurius* the bishop of Carthage in Africa dying in the year 311, the majority of the people and of the clergy elected *Cæcilian* the archdeacon to the vacant chair; and he was

(1) See in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. vi., pt. i., ed. Ritter, various and peculiarly severe laws of the emperors against the Manichæans. In the year 372, *Valentinian* senior forbid their holding meetings, and laid their preachers under heavy penalties, p. 126. In the year 381, *Theodosius* the Great pronounced them infamous, and deprived them of all the rights of citizens, p. 133. See other laws even more severe than these, p. 137, 138, 170, &c. [The writers who confused the Manichæans, are very fully enu-

merated by *Dr. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzerereyen*, vol. i., p. 808, &c.—*Schl.*]

(2) See the law of *Theodosius*, in the *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 134, 136–138.—[The popular names assumed by the Manichæans, were, *ἐγκραῖται*, *Continentis*, from their condemning marriage; *ἀποτάκτικοι*, *set apart* or consecrated to God; *σακκοφόροι*, *wearers of sackcloth*; *ὕδροπαράται*, *presenters of water*, from their using water only in the eucharist; and *Solitarii*, *Solitaries* or monks.—*Tr.*]

consecrated immediately, without waiting for the bishops of Numidia, by the bishops of Africa [Proper, or the province of which Carthage was the capital]. The Numidian bishops, who according to custom should have been present at the consecration, were highly offended at being excluded from the ceremony; and therefore, having assembled at Carthage, they summoned *Cæcilian* to appear before them. The feelings of these excited bishops were still more inflamed, by the efforts of certain presbyters of Carthage, especially of *Botrus* and *Celesius* the competitors of *Cæcilian*; and by an opulent lady named *Lucilla*, who was unfriendly to *Cæcilian* (by whom she had been reproved for her superstition) and who distributed large sums of money among those Numidians that they might vigorously oppose the new bishop. When therefore *Cæcilian* refused to appear before the tribunal of these bishops, they, seventy in number, and headed by *Secundus* bishop of Tigris, with the approbation of a considerable part of the clergy and people of Carthage, pronounced *Cæcilian* unworthy of his office, and created *Majorinus* his deacon bishop of Carthage. Hence the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, headed by the two bishops *Cæcilian* and *Majorinus*.

§ 3. The Numidians stated two grounds of their sentence against *Cæcilian*. (I.) That the principal bishop concerned in his consecration, *Felix* of Aptunga, was a *traditor*; that is, that during the persecution of Diocletian he had delivered up the sacred books to the magistrates to be burned, and therefore that he was an apostate from *Christ*, and of course could not impart the Holy Ghost to the new-made bishop. (II.) That *Cæcilian* himself when a deacon had been hard-hearted and cruel to the witnesses for *Christ*, or the *martyrs*, during the Diocletian persecution, and had forbidden food to be carried to them in prison. To these two causes they added the contumacy of *Cæcilian*, who being summoned to a trial before them refused to appear. Among these Numidian bishops, no one was more ardent and violent than *Donatus* the bishop of *Casae Nigrae*, whence, as most writers suppose, the whole party opposed to *Cæcilian* were from him called *Donatists*; though there are those who think the name was derived from another *Donatus*, whom the Donatists called *the Great*. (3) In a very short time this controversy was diffused over the whole not only of Numidia but even of Africa, and most of the cities had two bishops, one taking sides with *Cæcilian* and the other with *Majorinus*.

§ 4. The Donatists having brought this controversy before *Constantine* the Great in the year 313, the emperor committed the examination of it to *Melchades* the Roman bishop, with whom as assessors he joined three

(3) In the Donatist contests, two persons of the name of *Donatus* distinguished themselves; the one was a Numidian, and bishop of *Casae Nigrae*; the other was the second leader of the Donatists, succeeded *Majorinus* as bishop of *Carthage*, and on account of his learning and virtues was honoured by his partisans with the title of the *Great*. The learned have raised the question, from which of these men did the Donatists derive their name! Arguments of about equal strength may be adduced on both sides of this unimportant question. I should think the name was derived from both. [The Donatists re-

ceived several names. In the commencement of the schism, they were called (pars Majorini) the *Party of Majorinus*. Afterwards they were called *Donatians* and *Donatists*; though they would not allow of this name, which was given them by the orthodox. Finally they were called (Montenses) *Mountaineers*, (a name which they bore only at Rome, and either because they held their meetings in a *mountain* or because they resembled the *Montanists*), also *Campitae*, and *Rupitae* [or *Rupitani*, because they assembled on the *plains* and among the clefts of the *rocks*.]—*Schl.*]

bishops from Gaul. In this court *Cæcilian* was acquitted of the charges alleged against him; but the allegations against *Felix* of Aptunga who had consecrated him, were not examined. The emperor therefore, in the year 314, committed the cause of *Felix* to the separate examination of *Aelian* his proconsul for Africa, by whom *Felix* was pronounced innocent. But the Donatists raised many exceptions against the decisions of *Melchiades* and *Aelian*, and especially they objected to the small number of bishops who were joined with *Melchiades* as judges. They said, a formal decision of seventy venerable bishops of Numidia, ought undoubtedly to have far more weight than a decree of nineteen bishops—the number present at Rome(4)—and they but partially acquainted with African affairs. To quiet these murmurs the emperor, in the year 314, appointed a much larger tribunal to meet at Arles, composed of bishops from the provinces of Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Here again the Donatists lost their cause, and appealed to a trial before the emperor himself. He did not reject the appeal, but in the year 316 examined the cause at Milan, the parties being present before him. His decision also was against the Donatists; (5) and this contumacious party now cast reproaches on the emperor himself; and complained that *Hosius* the bishop of Corduba, who was the friend both of the emperor and of *Cæcilian*, had corrupted the mind of the former to give an unrighteous decision. This moved the emperor's indignation; and he now (in the year 316) ordered their temples to be taken from them in Africa, and the seditious bishops to be banished, and some of them also—perhaps for the licentiousness of their tongues and pens—to be put to death. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa, for the Donatist party was very numerous and powerful; and the emperor in vain strove to allay these tumults by his envoys.

§ 5. It was unquestionably amid these terrible commotions, that those called *Circumcelliones*(6) first originated; a furious, headlong, sanguinary

(4) ["The emperor, in his letters to *Melchiades*, named no more than three prelates, viz., *Maternus*, *Rheticus*, and *Marinus*, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that they were at last nineteen in all."—*Macl.*]

(5) No proofs could be more clear than those afforded by this whole controversy, of the emperor's supreme power in matters of religion. Indeed, no person in those times thought of a single supreme judge over the whole church appointed by *Christ* himself. The conventions at Rome and Arles are commonly called *councils*; but whoever views them impartially will perceive that they were not properly *councils*, but rather *courts* held by special judges appointed by the emperor, or to speak in the language of modern times, *High Commissions*. [To this opinion *Dr. Walch* subscribes, in his *Historie der Ketzererey*, vol. iv., p. 343, &c., where he says: "The whole history speaks out plainly, that in settling this controversy and restoring

peace the bishop of Rome did nothing, and the emperor everything. In the numerous transactions the bishop *Melchiades* appears only once, and then not as supreme head of the church, but merely as the emperor's *commissioner* charged with the execution of his commands. No papal ordinance, no appeal to the court of Rome, no dernier decision is conceivable here. Of course the ecclesiastical law of Africa in that age had no article respecting the authority of the pope. On the contrary, from the commencement till the final subjugation of the Donatists, we everywhere meet with the *emperor*, imperial trials, imperial commissioners, imperial laws, imperial punishments, imperial executive officers, all in full operation"—*Schl.*]

(6) [They were called *Circumcelliones* (*vagrants*), or by contraction *Circelliones*, from the (*cellae*) cottages of the peasants around which they hovered, without having any fixed residence. They styled themselves *Agonistici* (*combatants*), pretending that they were *combating* and vanquishing the devil. *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit., p. 157, thinks it cannot be proved that the *Circumcelliones* appeared on

set, composed of the peasantry and rustic populace, who espousing the cause of the Donatists defended it by the force of arms, and roaming through the province of Africa filled it with slaughter, rapine and burnings, and committed the most atrocious crimes against the adverse party. This mad throng, which disregarded death and every evil, nay, faced death when there was occasion with the greatest alacrity, brought extreme odium upon the Donatists: and yet it does not appear from any unexceptionable documents, that the Donatist bishops, and especially those possessed of any measure of good sense and religion, approved or instigated their proceedings. The storm continuing to increase and seeming to threaten a civil war, *Constantine* after attempting a reconciliation without effect, at the suggestion of the prefects of Africa, repealed the laws against the Donatists, [A.D. 321], and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties at their own option. [The Donatists soon became very numerous throughout Africa. In some places they outnumbered the Catholics. In the year 330, one of their councils consisted of no less than 270 bishops. See *Augustine*, Ep. 93.]

§ 6. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, his son *Constans*, to whom the African provinces were assigned, in the year 348, sent into Africa *Macarius* and *Paulus* as his lieutenants, to heal this deplorable schism, and to persuade the Donatists to a reconciliation with the orthodox. But the chief Donatist bishop *Donatus*, whom his sect denominated the Great, strenuously opposed a reconciliation; and the other bishops followed his example. The *Circumcelliones* still contended furiously, with slaughter and war, in support of the party whose interest they espoused. After *Macarius* had vanquished these in battle at Bagnia [or Bagaja], he no longer recommended, but commanded peace and reconciliation. A few *Donatists* obeyed; the majority either fled or were sent into banishment, and among them *Donatus* the Great; but many suffered the severest punishments. In this persecution of the Donatists, which lasted thirteen years, many things were done, as the *Catholics* themselves concede,(7) which no upright, impartial, and humane person can easily say were righteous and just. And hence the numerous complaints made by the Donatists of the cruelty of their adversaries.(8)

§ 7. *Julian* on his accession to the government of the empire in the year 362, permitted the Donatists to return to their country and to enjoy their former liberty. After their return, they in a short time drew the greater part of Africa into their communion.(9) *Gratian* enacted indeed

the stage before the time of *Constans*.—*Schl.*]

(7) I will here give a quotation from *Optatus* of Meleui, whom none will refuse as a witness in this case, (de Schismate Donatist. lib. iii., § 1, p. 51, ed. *Du Pin*). “Ab Operariis unitatis” (the imperial legates *Macarius* and *Paulus*) “multa quidem asperere gesta sunt.—Fugerunt omnes Episcopi cum clericis suis, aliqui sunt mortui: qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt.” Through this whole book, *Optatus* is at much pains to apologize for this severity, the blame of which he casts upon the Donatists. Yet he does not dissemble, that

all of it cannot by any means be approved or justified

(8) See the *Collatio Carthagin.* di. ter. tiae, § 258, at the end of *Optatus*, p. 315.

(9) [When the Donatists returned by the permission of *Julian*, they demanded of the orthodox the restoration of their churches. And as the latter were not willing to give them up, and as little could be expected from the civil authorities, the Donatists felt justified in relying upon their own resources. The most unhappy proceedings ensued, which have brought lasting disgrace upon the Donatists. Bloodshed, merciless denial of the necessities of life, violation of females,

some laws against them, and especially in 377 commanded all their temples to be taken from them, and all their assemblies even in the fields and private houses to be broken up.(10) But the fury of the *Circumcelliones* who were the soldiery of the Donatists, and the fear of producing intestine war, undoubtedly prevented the vigorous execution of these laws: for it appears that in the conclusion of this century the Donatist community was so extensive in Africa as to have more than 400 bishops. As the century drew to a close however, two things impaired not a little the energies of this very flourishing community. The one was a great schism in it, occasioned by one *Maximinus*;(11) which afforded the Catholics great advantage in opposing the Donatists. The other was the zeal of *Augustine*, who was first a presbyter and then bishop of Hippo. For he assailed them most vigorously in sermons, in conferences, by his advice, by his admonitions, and his activity in conventions; and being very ardent and energetic, he roused against them not only Africa but all Christendom, as well as the imperial court.(12)

§ 8. That the Donatists were sound in doctrine, their adversaries admit; nor were their lives censurable, if we except the enormities of the *Circumcelliones* which were detested by the greatest part of the Donatists. Their fault was, that they regarded the African church as having fallen from the rank and the privileges of a true church, and as being destitute of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, in consequence of its adherence to *Cæcilian*, notwithstanding his offences and those of his consecrator, *Felix* of Aptunga; and all other churches also which united and communed with that of Africa, they looked upon as defiled and polluted; and believed that themselves alone, on account of the sanctity of their bishops, merited the name of the true, pure, and holy church; and in consequence of these opinions, they avoided all communion with other churches in order to escape defilement. This error led them to maintain, that the sacred rites and administrations of the Christians who disagreed with them were destitute of all efficacy, and not only to rebaptize those who came over to them from other societies, but either to exclude from the sacred office or to reordain those ministers of religion who joined their community. This schismatic pestilence scarcely extended beyond Africa; for the few small

in a word, the worst excesses of an oppressed party, which after long-continued sufferings felt itself authorized to take unsparing revenge, attended the restoration of the Donatists; and by craft and violence their congregations were enlarged. The orthodox made resistance, and would not tamely suffer abuse. And hence arose those tumultuous scenes, which the magistrates reported to the court; and very probably, had *Julian* lived a little longer, persecuting laws would have been issued by the government. See *Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv., p. 175.—*Schl.*]

(10) [*Codex Theodos.*, l. ii., ne sanct. Bapt. iteretur.—*Schl.*]

(11) [On this schism among the Donatists, and others of less magnitude, see *Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv., p. 258–267.—*Schl.*]

(12) [A full catalogue of the writings of *Augustine* against the Donatists, is given by *Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv., p. 254, &c., and of his other efforts against them, an account is given, *ibid.*, p. 181, &c. We will make here the single remark, that it was during these contests *Augustine* first exhibited in his writings that horrid principle, that *heretics are to be punished with temporal punishments and death*;—a principle wholly inconsistent with Christianity, and one which in after ages served as an excuse for inhuman cruelties. Only read *Augustine's* 48th Epistle, ad Vincent., and his 50th, ad Bonifac., and several others; and you will there meet with all the plausible arguments, which the spirit of persecution in after ages so dressed up—to the disgrace of Christianity—as to blind the eyes of kings.—*Schl.*]

congregations which they formed in Spain and Italy had no permanence, and were soon broken up. (13)

§ 9. Not long after the commencement of the Donatist controversy, or in the year 317, another storm of greater consequence and more pernicious, arose in Egypt, and spread its ravages over the whole Christian world. The ground of this contest was, the doctrine of *three persons in the Godhead*; a doctrine which, during the three preceding centuries, had not been in all respects defined. It had indeed often been decided, in opposition to the Sabellians and others, that there is a *real* difference between the Father and the Son, and also between them and the Holy Spirit, or as we commonly express it, that there are three distinct persons in the Godhead. But the mutual relations of these persons, and the nature of the difference between them, had not been a subject of dispute, and therefore nothing had been decreed by the church on these points. Much less was there any prescribed phraseology, which it was necessary to use when speaking on this mystery. The doctors therefore explained this subject in different ways, or gave various representations of the difference between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without offence being taken. The majority in Egypt and the neighbouring countries, had on this subject as well as others, followed the opinions of *Origen*, who taught that the *Son is in God*, what *reason is in man*, and that the Holy Spirit is nothing else but the *divine energy or power of acting* and working; which opinion, if it be not cautiously stated, may lead among other difficulties to the subversion of any real distinction between the divine persons, or in other words to Sabellianism.

§ 10. *Alexander* the bishop of Alexandria,—it is uncertain on what occasion,—expressed himself very freely on this subject in a meeting of his presbyters; and maintained among other things, that the Son possesses not only the same dignity as the Father, but also the same *essence*. (14) But *Arius*, one of the presbyters, a man of acuteness and fluency, influenced perhaps and actuated by ill-will towards his bishop, (15) at first de-

(13) A more full account of the Donatists is given by *Hen. Valesius*, Diss. de schismate Donatarum, which is subjoined to his edition of *Eusebius' Historia Ecclesiastica*:—by *Tho. Ittig*, Historia Donatismi, in an appendix to his book de Hæresibus ævi Apostolici, p. 241,—by *Herm. Witsius*, Miscellaneor. sacrar. tom. i., lib. iv., p. 742,—by *Hen. Noris*, Historia Donatiana, a posthumous work, which the brothers *Ballerini* enlarged and published, Opp., tom. iv., p. xlv., &c.,—and by *Tho. Long*, History of the Donatists, Lond., 1677, 8vo. The narrative we have given above, is derived from the original sources; and if our life is spared, it will in due time be corroborated by a statement of the requisite testimonies. [What chancellor *Mosheim* was prevented from fulfilling by his death, his successor in the professorial chair of church history, *Dr. Walch*, has now accomplished, to the satisfaction of all the friends of this branch of knowledge, in the fourth volume of his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, p. 1-354.—*Schl.*]

(14) See *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 5. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 2.

(15) [A historian should be cautious of judging of the motives of human actions; for there are cases, in which a man's motives are discernible only to the eye of Omniscience. The present is such a case. Here we can express only a dubious "*perhaps*," when we impartially survey the sources of the history of *Arius*. We commonly read, it is true, that ambition led *Arius* to contradict his bishop, having been his rival when the see was vacant. But this cannot be proved by credible testimony: and his opposers, *Alexander* and *Athanasius*, who would surely have used this fact to his disadvantage if it had been known to them, observe a profound silence on the subject. On the contrary, *Philostorgius* relates, (Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 3), that *Arius*, when the votes of the electors were very favourable to himself, modestly directed the choice on *Alexander*. *Philostorgius*, it must be owned, was an Arian in sentiment, and

nied the truth of *Alexander's* positions, on the ground that they were allied to the Sabellian errors which were condemned by the church, and then going to the opposite extreme, he maintained that the Son is totally and *essentially* distinct from the Father; that he was only the first and noblest of those created beings whom God the Father formed out of nothing, and the instrument which the Father used in creating this material universe, and therefore, that he was inferior to the Father both in *nature* and in *dignity*. (16) What were his views of the Holy Spirit, is not equally mani-

his testimony is of no great weight. But the direct contrary to what he states, is not capable of proof. The motives therefore, which actuated Arius in opposing his bishop, must be regarded as dubious. Probably something of human infirmity was found on both sides. The conduct of *Arius* in the contest itself, betrays pride, a conceit of learning, and a contentious disposition. On the other hand, the Arians complain that *Alexander* was actuated by envy and personal hatred of Arius, because the great popularity of Arius had excited his jealousy. See *Dr. Walch, Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 395, &c.—*Schl.*]

(16) [Both *Alexander* and *Arius* have left us statements, each of his own doctrinal views, and also of what he understood to be the sentiments of his antagonist. The statements are in their private letters, written after long and public discussions at Alexandria, and when Arius and his friends were cast out of the church. The letter of *Alexander* is addressed to his namesake, *Alexander* of Byzantium, since Constantinople; and that of *Arius* is to his friend *Eusebius* of Nicomedia. Both are preserved by *Theodoret*, *Hist. Eceles.* l. i., c. 4, 5. It may gratify the reader who has not access to the original, to peruse the following extracts, containing the grand points as originally contested in the great Arian controversy and in the language of the first combatants.—*Alexander* states that *Arius* and his adherents, denying the divinity of our Saviour, pronounced him τοῖς πᾶσι ἰσὺν εἶναι on a level with all other creatures. He says that they held, *there was a time when the Son of God was not; and he who once had no existence, afterwards did exist; and from that time was, what every man naturally is: for (say they) God made all things of nothing, including the Son of God in this creation of all things both rational and irrational: and of course, pronouncing him to be of a changeable nature, and capable of virtue and of sin.*—The doctrine just risen up in opposition to the piety of the church, is that of *Elion* and *Artemas*, and is an imitation of that of *Paul of Samosata*. *Alexander* then gives his own views, as follows: We believe, as the Apostolic church does, in

*the only unbegotten Father, who derived his existence from no one, and is immutable and unalterable, always the same and uniform, unsusceptible of increase or diminution; the giver of the law and the prophets and the gospels; Lord of the patriarchs and apostles and of all saints: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, not begotten from nothing, but from the living Father; and not after the manner of material bodies, by separations and effluxes of parts, as Sabellius and Valentinian supposed; but in an inexplicable and indescribable manner, agreeably to the declaration before quoted: Who shall declare his generation? For his existence (ὕποστασις) is inscrutable to all mortal beings, just as the Father is inscrutable; because created intelligences are incapable of understanding this divine generation from the Father.—No one knoweth what the Father is, but the Son; and no one knoweth what the Son is, but the Father.—He is unchangeable, as much as the Father; lacks nothing; is the perfect Son, and the absolute likeness of the Father, save only that he is not unbegotten.—Therefore to the unbegotten Father, his proper dignity (ὀκείον ἀξίωμα) must be preserved. And to the Son also suitable honour must be given, by ascribing to him an eternal generation (ἀναρχὸν γέννησιν) from the Father. Such is the statement of *Alexander*.—The letter of *Arius* is as follows: To his very dear lord, that man of God, the faithful, orthodox *Eusebius*; *Arius*, who is unjustly persecuted by the bp. *Alexander*, on account of that all-conquering truth which thou also defendest, greeting in the Lord. As my father *Ammonius* is going to *Nicomedia*, it seemed proper for me to address you by him, and to acquaint the native love and affection which you exercise towards the brethren for God and his Christ's sake, that the bishop greatly oppresses and persecutes us, putting everything in motion against us; and so as to drive us out of the city, as if we were atheists; because we do not agree with him, publicly asserting that God always was, and the Son always was; that he was always the Father, always the Son; that the Son was of God himself; and that because your brother *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, and *Theodotus*, and *Paulinus*, and*

fest. That his views of the Son of God were combined with some other opinions differing from the common sentiments of Christians, cannot be doubted : (17) but no one of the ancients has left us a connected and systematic account of the religion professed by *Arius* and his associates. (18)

§ 11. The opinions of *Arius* were no sooner divulged, than they found very many abettors, and among them men of distinguished talents and rank, both in Egypt and the neighbouring provinces. *Alexander* on the other hand accused *Arius* of blasphemy, before two councils assembled at Alexandria, and cast him out of the church. (19) He was not discouraged by

Athanasius, and Gregory, and Aëtius, and all they of the East, say that God was before the Son, and without beginning, they are accursed; except only Philogonius, and Hellanicus, and Macarius, unlearned and heretical men, who say of the Son, one of them, that he is an emanation; another, that he is an emission; and another, that he is equally unbegotten; which impieties we could not even hear, though the heretics should threaten us with a thousand deaths. As to what we say and believe, we have taught, and still teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a portion of the unbegotten, in any manner: nor was he formed out of any subjacent matter, but that in will and purpose, he existed before all times and before all worlds, perfect God (πλήρης θεός) the only-begotten, unchangeable; and that before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established, he was not; for he was never unbegotten.

We are persecuted, because we say, the Son had a beginning, but God was without beginning. We are also persecuted, because we say, that he is from nothing (ἐξ ἑκ ὕτων ἐξῆν); and this we say, in as much as he is not a portion of God, nor formed from any subjacent matter. Therefore we are persecuted. The rest you know. Ibid you adieu in the Lord.—According to these statements, both the Arians and the orthodox considered the Son of God and Saviour of the world, as a derived existence, and as *generated* by the Father. But they differed on two points. I. The orthodox believed his generation was from eternity, so that he was coeval with the Father. But the Arians believed, there was a time when the Son was not. II. The orthodox believed the Son to be derived of and from the Father; so that he was *ὁμοούσιος* of the same essence with the father. But the Arians believed, that he was formed out of nothing ἐξ ἑκ ὕτων εἶναι, by the creative power of God. Both, however, agreed in calling him God, and in ascribing to him divine perfections. As to his offices, or his being the Saviour of sinful men, it does not appear that they differed materially in their views. (See page 290, note 21.) Indeed so imperfect and fluctuating were the views of that age respecting the offices of *Christ*

and the way in which sinners are saved, that he was, for aught they could see, an equally competent Saviour, whether he were a finite creature, or the infinite and all-perfect God. Hence both the Arians and the orthodox then embraced the same system of theology in substance; and the chief importance, in a theological view, of their controversy respecting the Sonship of *Christ*, related to the assigning him that rank in the universe which properly belonged to him.—*Tr.*]

(17) [This conjecture of *Dr. Mosheim*, (which his former translator has swelled into a strong affirmation), appears to be gratuitous. See the preceding note.—*Tr.*]

(18) The history of the Arian contests is to be drawn from *Eusebius, de Vita Constantini Magni*; from various tracts of *Athanasius*, *Opp.*, tom. i.; from the *Eccles. Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret*; from *Epiphanius*, *Hæres. lxi.*; and from other writers of this and the following century. But among all these, there is not one whom we may justly pronounce free from partiality. And the Arian history still needs a writer of integrity, and void alike of hatred and love. There were faults on both sides; but those who hitherto have described this controversy, could discover the faults of only one of the parties. [This has now ceased to be absolutely true; since *Dr. Walch*, in the 2d vol. of his *Hist. der Ketzer-eyen*, p. 385–700, has so treated the history of Arius and his followers, that a man must himself be in the highest degree partial, if he can deny the honour of impartiality to *Dr. Walch*.—*Schl*] It is a common opinion, that *Arius* was too much attached to the sentiments of *Plato* and *Origen*. See *Dion. Petarius*, *Dogmat. Theol.*, tom. ii., l. i., c. 8, p. 38. But those who think so, are certainly in an error. For *Origen* and *Plato* differ widely from *Arius*; on the contrary, it cannot well be doubted, that *Alexander*, the opposer of Arius, in his explanation of the doctrine of three persons in one God, closely followed the footsteps of *Origen*. See *Ralph Cudworth's Intellectual System*, vol. i., p. 676, &c.

(19) [*Alexander* first employed milder measures; for he sent a letter, which was

this disgrace, but retiring to Palestine he wrote various letters to men of distinction, in which he laboured to demonstrate the truth of his doctrines, and with so much success that he drew over immense numbers to his side, and in particular *Eusebius* bishop of Nicomedia, who was a man of vast influence.(20) The emperor *Constantine*, who considered the discussion as relating to a matter of little importance and remote from the fundamentals of religion, at first addressed the disputants by letter, admonishing them to desist from contention.(21) But when he found that no-

subscribed by the clergy of Alexandria, to *Arius* and the other clergymen united with him, warning them to abandon their error. (*Athanasius*, Opp., tom. i., pt. i., p. 396.) When this measure failed, he brought the subject before the bishops of his party. He first held a council at Alexandria (A.D. 321), composed of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and then another assembly, composed only of the presbyters and deacons of the city of Alexandria and the province of Mareotis. The first was properly a council; the other was not. And hence it is, that some historians speak of but *one* council of Alexandria. See *Dr. Walch's* Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 140, and his Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ii., p. 424, &c.—*Schl.*]

(20) [These bishops held a council in Bithynia, probably at *Nicomedia*, in which 250 bishops are reported to have been present. Of their acts and decisions we know nothing more, than that they sent letters to all the bishops of Christendom, entreating them not to exclude the friends of *Arius* from their communion, and requesting them to intercede with *Alexander* that he would not do so.—“This first Arian council is either wholly overlooked by modern writers, or is confounded with that of Antioch in the year 330. *Sozomen* gives account of it, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 15. See *Nicetas*, in Biblioth. Max. Patr., tom. xxv., p. 151, and *Ceiller's* Histoire des Auteurs, tome iii., p. 566.” Thus *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml., p. 142. But *Dr. Walch* mistakes in saying that this council is *overlooked by modern writers*. It is mentioned by Maimbourg, Le Clerc, Du Pin, Fleury, Cave, Whitby, and Tillemont.—*Tr.*]

(21) [*Constantine* not only wrote a letter in the year 324, but he sent with it as his envoy, the famous *Hosius* bishop of Corduba. What part the envoy acted, is unknown; but the letter is extant, fully, in *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini M., lib. ii., c. 64-72, and with some curtailment, in *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 7. The most important part of this singular document, which however shows the feelings of one more solicitous for the great cause of our common Christianity, than for absolute perfection in speculative theology, is as follows.

“I learn then, that the origin of the present controversy was thus. Whereas you, *Alexander*, inquired of the presbyters, what each believed on one of the subjects contained in the law, or rather on a point of a vain controversy; and whereas you, *Arius*, inconsiderately advanced what ought not to have entered your mind, or if it did, should have been smothered in silence; hereupon dissension arose between you, communion has been denied, and the most holy people being split into two parties, the harmony of the whole body is destroyed. Wherefore, mutually forgiving one another, follow ye the counsel here fitly offered you by your fellow-worshipper [of the true God.] And what is it! It is, that it was unsuitable, at first, to put a question on such subjects; and when it was put, it was unsuitable to answer it. For such questions, being required by no law, but prompted by the contentiousness of unprofitable leisure,—though they may be proposed for the exercise of our natural powers,—ought to be kept to ourselves, and not rashly to be brought before public meetings, nor be inconsiderately trusted to the ears of the people. For, how few are there that can accurately comprehend and suitably explain the nature of so great and so exceedingly difficult subjects? Yet if any one thinks he could easily do this, how large a part of the people will he persuade to think so? or who can urge the critical examination of such questions, without hazarding a fall? Wherefore prating on such subjects is to be restrained; lest, either from the imbecility of our natures *we* should be unable to explain the subject proposed, or from the dulness of apprehension in our hearers *they* should not be able to comprehend exactly what is spoken; and lest, from one or the other of these causes, the people should incur the danger either of blasphemy or schism. Therefore let an unwise question in the one, and an inconsiderate answer in the other of you, mutually pardon each other. For the controversy between you, is not about the chief of the precepts of our law (the holy scripture); nor have you introduced any new heresy relating to practical religion; but you both have one and the same views, so that you may easily come together in the bonds

thing was effected by this measure, and that greater commotion was daily rising throughout the empire, he in the year 325 summoned that famous council of the whole church, which met at *Nice* in Bithynia, to put an end to this controversy. In this council, after various altercations and conflicts of the bishops, the doctrine of *Arius* was condemned, *Christ* was pronounced to be (*ὁμοῦσιος*) of the same essence with the Father, *Arius* was sent into exile in Illyricum, and his followers were compelled to assent to a *creed* or confession of faith, composed by the council. (22)

of fellowship. While you thus contend about little and exceedingly unimportant points (*ὑπὲρ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων*), it is not suitable for so numerous a body of God's people to be under your guidance, on account of your dissension; indeed, it is not only unsuitable, but it is believed to be absolutely unlawful. That I may admonish your sagacity, by a smaller instance, I will say; all those philosophers who profess one system of doctrine, you know, very often differ on some part of their positions. But though they disagree in the perfection of their knowledge, yet on account of their union as to the system of their doctrine, they come together again harmoniously. Now if they do so, how much more reasonable is it for you, the appointed ministers of the great God, to be of one heart in the profession of the same religion. Let us look more attentively and closely into what is now advanced. *Is it right*, on account of the little vain disputes about words among you, for brethren to array themselves against brethren, and the precious assembly to be rent asunder by the ungodly strife of you who thus contend about trifles of no consequence? (*ὑπὲρ μικρῶν ἔγω καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀναγκαίων*;) This is vulgar and despicable: it is more befitting the folly of children, than the discretion of priests and wise men. Let us spontaneously depart from the temptations of the devil. Our great God, the common preserver of us all, hath extended to all the common light; and allow me his servant, under his providence, to bring my efforts to a successful issue, that by my admonitions, diligence, and earnest exhortations, I may bring his people to have fellowship in their meeting together. For since, as I said, ye both have one faith (*μία τίς ἐστιν ὑμῖν πίστις*), and one and the same understanding of our religion (*καὶ μία τῆς καθ' ἡμῶς ἀπίστεως σύνεσις*); and since the requirement of the law, in its various parts, binds all to one consent and purpose of mind; and as this thing, which has produced a little strife among you, does not extend to the power and efficacy of the whole gospel, (*μὴ πρὸς τὴν τῷ παντὸς δύναμιν ἀνήκει*), let it not at all produce separations and commotions among you. And these things I say, not to compel you to a perfect

consent on this very unwise and undefinable question. For the high privileges of communion may be preserved to you unimpaired, and the same fellowship may be kept up among you all, though there may be among you partial disagreement about some trivial point. For we do not all choose alike, nor is there one and the same disposition and judgment in us all. Therefore concerning the divine providence, let there be one faith, one understanding, and one covenant with God. But as for those trivial questions, which ye so elaborately discuss, though you should not think exactly alike, it is fit that the fact remain within your own cogitations, and be kept as a secret in your own breast. Let the privileges of mutual friendship, and the belief of the truth, and the precious worship of God, and the observance of his law, remain unimpaired among you. Return again to mutual friendship and charity; give to all the people their proper embraces; and, having purified as it were your own minds, do ye again recognise each other: for friendship, when it returns to a reconciliation, after ill-will is laid aside, often becomes more sweet than before. And restore to me also serene days, and nights void of care; so that there may be in reserve for me the enjoyment of the pure light, and the pleasures of a quiet life. If this fail, I must unavoidably sigh and be bathed in tears, and spend the residue of my days unquietly. For while the people of God, my fellow-workshippers, are so rent asunder by unreasonable and hurtful contentions, how can my mind be at ease and my thoughts at rest?"—*Tr.*]

(22) This *creed* is illustrated from ancient records, in a learned work on the subject, by *Joh. Christ. Suicer*, Utrecht, 1718, 4to. [The *creed* used in the Catholic, Lutheran, and English churches, and called the *Nicene* *creed*, is in reality the *creed* set forth by the council of *Constantinople* in the year 381. It is considerably more full than the original *Nicene* *creed*; which is here subjoined, together with a translation. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητὴν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, αἰτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς ἑσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς

§ 12. No part of church history perhaps, has acquired more celebrity, than this assembly of bishops at Nice to settle the affairs of the church; and yet, strange as it may appear, scarcely any part of ecclesiastical history has been investigated and explained more negligently. (23) The ancient writers are not agreed as to the time and year, nor the place, nor the number of the judges, nor the president of this council, nor as to many other particulars. (24) No written *journal* of the proceedings of this venerable

ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεῶ ἀληθινῶν, γεννηθέντα ὁ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' ἃ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἔρανῳ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸν δι' ἡμῶς τῶς ἀνθρώπων καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὰς ἁρὰς καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τὸς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε ἕκ ἑν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ἕκ ἑν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ ἑκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ ὁσίας φύσκοντες εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν τρεπτὸν ἢ ἄλλοιῳ ὄντων τὸν ὕον τῷ θεῷ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. See *Waleh*, Biblioth. Symbol. Vetus, p. 75, 76. Translation: We believe in one God, the Father, almighty, the maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only-begotten, (that is), of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and that are in earth: who for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, and became man; suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens; and will come to judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say, that there was a time when he was not, and that he was not, before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence, or that the Son of God is created, and mutable or changeable, the Catholic church doth pronounce accursed — *Tr.*]

(23) See *Tho. Ittig*, *Historia Concilii Niceni*, published after his death, [Lips., 1712, 4to.] *Jo. le Clerc*, *Bibliothèque historique et universelle*, tome x., p. 421, and tome xxii., p. 291. *Is. de Beausobre*, *Histoire de Manichéisme et de Manichéisme*, tome i., p. 520, &c. The accounts left us by the Orientals of this council, are contained in *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.*, p. 69, &c. [To the preceding works, may be added *Chr. W. Fr. Waleh's* *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 144–158.—*Schl.*]

(24) [Yet there is not great disagreement

on most of these points. There is scarcely a dissenting voice as to the *year*, which was A.D. 325; though there is a disagreement as to the *month* when the council first met, namely, whether it was the 13th of the Kalends of June or July, that is, the 20th of *May* or the 19th of *June*. All agree that the council closed on the emperor's *Vicennalia*, in July of that year. As to the *place*, there is overwhelming proof that it was the central hall or building in the imperial palace at *Nice* in Bithynia; which the emperor caused to be fitted up especially for the purpose. Some moderns however maintain, that this *hall* must have been a *church*; because they cannot believe, so holy a body would assemble any where except in a church duly consecrated. As to the *number of members* of which the council was composed, *Eusebius* indeed, (*de Vita Constantini*, iii., c. 8), says "they exceeded 250 bishops." But the MS. here is believed to be corrupted; for *Socrates*, (*Hist. Eccles.*, i., c. 8), expressly quoting this passage of *Eusebius*, says "they exceeded three hundred bishops." There is satisfactory proof that there were 318 members of the council, besides a vast number of clergymen and others who attended from curiosity or for their own improvement in knowledge. The ancient writers make no mention whatever of any *president* or *scribe* of the council. They represent the council as assembling, and the emperor as entering, advancing to the upper end of the hall, and upon a signal from the bishops, taking his seat, which was a golden chair; after which the whole council was seated, several of the principal bishops on the right and left of the emperor, and the main body of them arranged on the two sides of the hall. Before this formal opening of the council, there were several encounters of the bishops of different parties, and also of members of the council with the philosophers and others who were assembled in the city. Of these private contests, pompous accounts are left us by *Gelasius* and others. But when the council assembled in form, they did no business but remained silent, till the emperor came in. He was then addressed either by *Eustathius* of Antioch, or by *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, or by both, in short complimentary

tribunal was kept; at least none has reached us.(25) How many and what *canons* or ecclesiastical *laws*, were enacted, is not agreed on by the Oriental and the occidental Christians. The latter tell us they were only twenty in number; but the Orientals make them far more numerous.(26)

speeches; after which, he himself harangued the council; and having thrown into the fire, unread, all the private petitions and complaints which had been previously handed him, he bid them proceed to business. A free discussion now ensued; but it would seem, without the formalities observed in modern deliberative assemblies. Individuals of different sentiments offered their opinions; and the emperor heard, remarked, commended, or disapproved, and so influenced the whole proceedings as to bring about a good degree of unanimity. Yet he did not act the dictator or judge, but left the bishops to decide all the questions respecting faith and discipline, uncontrolled: for he regarded *them* as the divinely constituted judges of such matters. He only wished them to come to *some* agreement; which as soon as they had done, he regarded their decision as final, and as obligatory on himself as well as all others. How many sessions were held, we are not told. But after all the business was finished, on the 24th of July, when the emperor entered on the 20th year of his reign, he celebrated his Vicennialia with the council, in a splendid banquet in his own palace. On that occasion, *Eusebius* of Cæsarea delivered an oration in praise of *Constantine*, which is lost. After the feast, the bishops were dismissed with presents and exhortations to peace and love. They returned, as they came, by the public conveyances, having been supported by the emperor from the time they left their homes. See *Eusebius*, de Vita Constantini, l. iii., c. 6-22. *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., i., 8-11. *Sozomen*, H. E., i., 17-25. *Theodoret*, H. E., i., 7, 9, 10, 12. *Rufinus*, H. E., lib. i. *Gelasius* Cyzicenus, Comment. de Synodo Nicæno, libri iii., in *Harduin's* Concilia, tom. i., p. 345, &c. Acta Concilii Nicæni, in *Combeffis'* Auctarium Biblioth. Patr., tom. ii., p. 573. *Renaudot*, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin., p. 69, &c.; various Treatises in the first volume of the works of *Athanasius*, especially his Epistola de Nicænis Decretis; and several detached passages in *Epiphanius*, contra Hæreses, lib. iii. These are the only authentic sources for the history of this council.—Tr.]

(25) See *Henry Valesius*, Note on *Euseb.*, de Vita Constantini M., lib. iii., c. 14. *Maruthas*, a Syrian, wrote a history of this council; but it is lost. See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic., tom. i., p. 195, &c. [*Eusebius*, in the passage just referred to, says: "What met

the general approbation of the council, was committed to writing, and confirmed by the subscription of each member." Whence *Valesius* infers, that *nothing* was committed to writing by the council, except the *results* to which they came, and which they individually subscribed, namely, the *creed*, the *canons*, and the *synodic epistle*, which was addressed to the church of Alexandria and the brethren in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. He therefore supposes, the council kept no *Journal* or had no written *Acta Concilii*, in the technical sense of the phrase. And indeed, we have no intimation that they kept any journal of their proceedings, or had any proper scribe of council. What are called the Acta Concilii, as given us by *Gelasius* and others, are an account of various discussions between individual members of the council and certain philosophers or sophists, together with the creed, the canons, the synodic letter, several epistles of the emperor, one of *Eusebius* to his church of Cæsarea, and various extracts from ancient authors.—Tr.]

(26) *Thom. Ittig*, Supplem. Opp. Clementis Alex., p. 191. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic., tom. i., p. 22, 195, &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin., p. 71, and many others. [The 20 Nicene canons, and those only, were received by the ancient church. Some attempts indeed were made by the bishops of Rome, in the fifth century, to make certain canons of the council of *Sardica* pass for canons of the council of *Nice*. On that occasion the African bishops resisted, and sent to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, for complete copies of all the Nicene canons which they knew of. The returns showed that these 20 canons, and these only, were then recognised in the Greek church. See the acts of the 6th council of Carthage, A.D. 419. *Theodoret* also, (H. E., i., 8), and *Gelasius* Cyzicenus, (lib. ii., c. 31), expressly affirm, that the number of the Nicene canons was 20. But in the 16th century, an Arabic copy of 80 canons, including these 20, was brought from Alexandria to Rome, and soon afterwards translated and published. At first there was some doubt; but in a short time all the learned were fully satisfied, that the additional 60 canons were not of Nicene origin, though now regarded as such by most of the eastern sects. See *Natalis Alexander*, Hist. Eccles., cent. iv., dissert. xviii., vol.

From the canons universally received and from the other monuments of the council, it appears, not only that *Arius* was condemned by this council, but that other things were decreed, with a view to settle the affairs of the church. In particular, the controversy respecting the time of celebrating Easter, which had long perplexed Christians, was terminated; the Novatian disturbance, respecting the readmission of the lapsed to communion, was composed; the Meletian schism, with its causes, was censured; the jurisdiction of the greater bishops was defined; and several other matters of a like nature determined. (27) But while the prelates were eager

vii., p. 501–511, ed. Paris, 1742, 4to.—These 20 canons, (or 22, as some divide them), are extant in *Beveridge's* Pandect. Canon., tom. i., p. 58, &c., and in all the larger collections of councils.—The substance of them is as follows: The 1st canon forbids the admission of voluntary or self-made eunuchs to the sacred ministry. The 2d forbids the hasty ordination of new converts to Christianity; agreeably to 1 Tim. iii., 6, *Not a novice*, &c. The 3d forbids clergymen of all ranks, from having subinduced females or housekeepers; except only their nearest blood relations. The 4th directs that ordinations be generally performed by all the bishops of a province; and never by less than three bishops; and requires the confirmation of the metropolitan, in all cases. The 5th requires that an excommunication either of a clergyman or a layman by the sentence of a single bishop, shall be valid every where, till it is examined and judged of by a provincial council; and requires such a council to be held, for this and other objects of general interest, twice a year, once in the autumn and once a little before Easter. The 6th secures to the patriarch of *Alexandria* all the rights which he claimed by ancient usage, over the bishops and churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; also to the patriarchs of *Rome* and *Antioch*, their prerogatives; and gives to metropolitans, generally, a negative on all elections to the episcopal office within their respective provinces. The 7th gives to the bishop of *Aelia* (or Jerusalem) the rank of a metropolitan; but without depriving *Cæsarea*, the ancient metropolis, of its dignity. The 8th permits *Novatian* bishops and clergymen to return to the church and retain their rank and offices, on their assenting to the rules of the church respecting second marriages and communion with the lapsed. The 9th and 10th require that presbyters, who before their ordination had lapsed or had committed any other offence which was a canonical disqualification for the sacred office, be deprived of their office as soon as the disqualification is ascertained. The 11th requires the lapsed during the late persecution under *Licinius*, first, to do penance three years without the

doors of the church; secondly, six years in the porch among the catechumens; and thirdly, to be allowed to witness but not join in the celebration of the eucharist for two years more. The 12th requires flagrant apostates to go through the same course; but they must spend ten years in the second stage. Yet the bishops are to exercise discretionary power in regard to the length of time. The 13th allows the sacrament to be given to any penitent who seems to be dying; but if he recovers, he is to rank only with the penitents in the third stage.—By the 14th, lapsed catechumens are to spend three years in the first stage, or among those who worship without the doors of the church. By the 15th, the translation of bishops, presbyters, and deacons from one church to another, is forbidden. By the 16th, presbyters or deacons, forsaking their own church and going over to others, are to be denied communion and be sent back: bishops also are forbidden to ordain the subjects of other bishops, without their consent. The 17th requires the deposition of all clergymen who loan money or goods on interest. By the 18th, deacons are forbidden to present the bread and wine to the presbyters or to partake themselves, before the bishop; or to sit among the presbyters. By the 19th, the followers of *Paul* of Samosata, on returning to the church are to be rebaptized; and to be reordained before they can officiate as clergymen. The 20th disapproves of kneeling at prayers on the Lord's day, and from Easter to Pentecost.—*Tr.*]

(27) [The synodic epistle, which is preserved by *Soerates*, H. E., i., 9, and by *Theodoret*, H. E., i., 9, acquaints us with the principal transactions of the council; and also shows the spirit of that venerable body. It is as follows: "To the great and holy, by the grace of God, the church of the Alexandrians, and to the beloved brethren of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, the bishops assembled at Nice, and composing the great and holy synod, send greeting in the Lord.

"Forasmuch as, by the grace of God, the most pious emperor *Constantine* having called us together from various cities and prov-

to correct the faults of others, they narrowly escaped falling into a great one themselves. For they were on the point of imposing celibacy on the clergy by an express law; but they were prevented by *Paphnutius*, who had himself lived all his days in celibacy. (28)

inces, a great and holy synod is assembled at Nice; it seemed altogether necessary that an epistle be sent to you, in the name of the sacred synod; that you may have means of knowing what things have been moved, and examined, and what have been sanctioned. First of all then, an inquiry was made in the presence of the most pious emperor *Constantine*, into the impiety and iniquity of *Arius* and his associates; and it was determined by the voice of all, that his impious doctrine is to be anathematized, as also the blasphemous words and terms he used; he having blasphemously said, that *the Son of God was from nothing*, and that *there was a time when he was not*, and saying that *the Son of God, by the arbitrament of his will, is capable of either virtue or vice*; and pronouncing him *a creature and a work*: all which the holy synod hath anathematized, not enduring so much as to hear this impious doctrine or rather madness, and these blasphemous words. What was the issue of the proceedings against him, ye have heard already, or will hear; lest we should seem to insult over a man who has received the deserved recompense of his wickedness. But his impiety prevailed so far as to involve in destruction with him *Theonas* of Marmarica, and *Secundus* of Ptolemais; for they received the same sentence. After the grace of God had delivered us from that evil doctrine and impiety and blasphemy, and from the persons who dared to raise discord and division among a once peaceable people, there yet remained the rashness of *Meletius* and of those ordained by him. And what the synod decreed on this subject, beloved brethren, we now inform you. It was determined that *Meletius* (whom the synod treated with more lenity, for according to the strictness of law he deserved no indulgence) should remain in his own city; but should have no authority either to ordain, to nominate for office, nor be seen in any other city or place on such business, but should only possess the naked title of honour. As for those raised to office by him, after being confirmed by a more solemn consecration, fellowship is to be given them; yet on the condition, that they so hold their office and ministry, as always to take rank after all in every parish or church who were examined and ordained previously by our dearest colleague *Alexander*; and moreover that they have no authority to elect or to nominate such persons as they like, or indeed to do any thing,

without the consent of some bishop of the Catholic church who is *Alexander's* suffragan. But those who, by the grace of God and by your prayers, have never been found in any schism but have remained blameless in the Catholic church, shall have power to nominate and elect such as are worthy of the sacred office, and in general, to do every thing that accords with law and ecclesiastical usage. And if it happen that any of those now [bishops] in the church should be removed by death, then let those lately admitted be advanced to the honours of the deceased; provided always, that they appear deserving, and the people choose them, and that the bishop of Alexandria concur in the election and confirm it. And this privilege is conceded to all others; but not so in regard to *Meletius* personally, to whom, on account of his former irregularity and his headlong rashness of temper, it is judged, no power or authority should be given, he being capable of again exciting the same disorders. And these are the things which relate particularly and especially to Egypt, and to the most holy church of Alexandria. But if any other canon or decree shall be made, as our lord and most precious fellow minister and brother is present with us, when he shall arrive he will give you a more exact account, for he will have been an actor and co-operator in the things done. We also announce to you the harmony there is in regard to the most holy paschal feast; that this matter is happily settled, through the assistance of your prayers, so that all the brethren in the East, who before kept the festival with the Jews, will hereafter keep it in harmony with the Romans, with us, and with all those who from ancient times have kept it with us. Therefore, rejoicing in the happy issue of affairs and the peaceful harmony that exists, and that all heresy is extirpated, do ye receive, with greater honour and more ardent love, our fellow minister and your bishop, *Alexander*, who has gladdened us with his presence, encountering so great labour in his advanced age, that peace might be restored among you. And pray for us all, that whatever has been well determined upon, may remain steadfast, through our Lord Jesus Christ, being done, as we trust, according to the good pleasure of God the Father, in the Holy Spirit: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."—*Tr.*]

(28) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., lib. i., c. 11. Compare *Fran. Baldwin's* *Constantinus*

§ 13. But the passions of men were more efficient, than either the decrees of the Nicene council, or the authority of the emperor. For there were those who, though they did not fall in with the doctrine of *Arius*, yet were dissatisfied with some things in the decrees and the creed of the council ;(29) and the *Arians* left no means untried, to free themselves from the evils inflicted on them by those decrees. And the issue was agreeable to their wishes. For in a few years after the Nicene council, an Arian presbyter, whom *Constantia* the emperor's sister at her death had recommended to the care of her brother, succeeded in persuading *Constantine* the Great that *Arius* had been unjustly oppressed by his enemies. Accordingly, in the year 330, the emperor recalled *Arius* from exile, rescinded the decrees passed against his associates and friends, and permitted *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, the principal supporter of Arius, and his powerful faction now thirsting for revenge, to persecute the defenders of the Nicene council.(30) They assailed no one more fiercely than *Athanasius*, the

Magnus, p. 76, and *Geor. Calixtus*, de conjugio Cleric., p. 170, &c.

(29) [The word *ὁμοούσιος* (of the same essence) was in particular, not agreeable to all. At first seventeen bishops hesitated to subscribe the creed and the condemnation of *Arius*, because they wished to shun the appearance of favouring the Sabellian error; and they objected, that the word *ὁμοούσιος* had been disapproved of in the time of *Paul* of Samosata. (*Socrates*, H. E., i., c. 8, 23, &c. *Basil*, Ep. 360.) And in fact, *Paul* of Samosata had misused the word *ὁμοούσιος*, so as to controvert any other distinction between the Son or Word and the Father, except the difference of names, and of external relations in reference to the divine manifestation. And though it is not fully proved that this term, in the Samosatian sense of it, was rejected by a council at Antioch in the year 269, (which decision at Antioch is pronounced fabulous, by *Dr. Feuerlein*, in his Dissert. on the question: *Dei filium patri esse ὁμοούσιον antiqui ecclesiæ doctores in concilio Antiocheno utrum negaverint?* Gotting., 1755)—yet it is certain, that the Arians had before alleged this Antiochian decree, and no one had charged them with mistake in so doing. Nevertheless those who were not pleased with the creed, were generally brought to acquiesce in it; partly by the threats of the emperor to banish all who would not subscribe, and partly by the advice of the princess *Constantia*. Only *Arius*, with the bishops *Theonas* and *Secundus*, persevered in a refusal. Yet some, [namely, *Eusebius* of Nicomedia, and *Theognis*, bishop of Nice], subscribed only the creed itself, and not also the anathema.—*Schl.*]

(30) [So sudden a change was not to be expected. The council of Nice had taken every precaution to prevent the further spread of

Arianism; and its decrees had been approved by other councils in distant provinces, and thus had obtained the authority of decrees of the whole church. The emperor had superadded to the sentence of the bishops civil penalties, appointing exile to recusants; and had condemned the writings of *Arius* to the flames, and commanded them to be delivered up on pain of death. [See the emperor's letter to the bishops and people, in *Socrates*, H. E., i., 9.] Thus the Arian party seemed to be wholly suppressed. But it only seemed to be so. Four years after, the atmosphere about the court of *Constantine* at once became clear and serene to the Arians; and the causes of so great a change are not well known, for the history of *Constantine* here has a chasm of three years. The princess *Constantia* seems actually to have had a hand in this great revolution. The bishops who were favourably disposed towards *Arius*, had recommended themselves to her, by yielding in the Nicene council, and subscribing the creed, very much in compliance with her recommendation. (*Philostorgius*, H. E., i., c. 9.) This attention shown her, would naturally open a way for them to the confidence of the princess. And therefore the statement of *Socrates* (l. i., c. 25), and *Sozomen* (l. iii., c. 19) is not improbable; namely, that it was by her, and by an Arian priest whom she at her death recommended to him, that *Constantine* was brought to entertain more favourable views of the Arians. At the instigation of this priest, the emperor despatched a gracious letter to *Arius*, bidding him come to the court. *Arius* hastened to Constantinople with his friend *Euzoius*, and was graciously heard by the emperor, whom he satisfied as to his orthodoxy. At the requisition of the emperor, they both presented a confession of their faith, which was so artfully drawn up as to conceal their

bishop of Alexandria. When he could in no way be brought to restore *Arius* to his former honours and ecclesiastical standing, *Athanasius* was first deprived of his office, in a council held at Tyre A.D. 335, and then banished to Gaul; while in the same year, by a numerous council held at Jerusalem, *Arius* and his friends were solemnly admitted to the communion of the church. But by none of these proceedings could the Alexandrians be induced to receive *Arius* among their presbyters. Accordingly the emperor called him to Constantinople in the year 336, and ordered *Alexander* the bishop of that city, to open the doors of his church to him. But before that could take place, *Arius* died at Constantinople in a tragical manner. (31) And the emperor himself closed life shortly after.

real sentiments under orthodox phraseology. In this way *Arius* obtained permission to return to Alexandria. Antecedently to this, *Eusebius* bishop of Nicomedia, and *Theognis* bishop of Nice, had obtained complete reinstatement in their offices; and the former now commenced persecuting the orthodox party, and especially *Athanasius*. The deposition of *Athanasius* was decreed by the council of Tyre; but his banishment was by order of the emperor, before whom he was accused of threatening to prevent the exportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople. As *Arius* met with more opposition at Alexandria than he expected, and as his presence there caused commotions which seemed almost to amount to an insurrection, he was called back to Constantinople. Here he had another hearing before the emperor, and swore to a formula of faith presented by himself, which sounded very orthodox. The emperor was so well satisfied by this exhibition of *Arius*, that he sent for *Alexander* the bishop of Constantinople, and earnestly enjoined upon him to admit *Arius* the next Sunday to his communion. The terrified bishop retired to the church of St. Irene, and there prayed that the calamity might be averted. On the day appointed, *Arius*, accompanied by *Eusebius* of Nicomedia and others of his adherents, proceeded through the principal streets of the city, in order to enter the church in triumph, and entertained his friends with playful discourse. But as he passed along, the calls of nature obliged him to step aside. He entered one of the public offices erected for such purposes, and left his servants waiting at the door; and here he died with a violent colic. See *Dr. Walch's* *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 486, &c.—*Schl.*]

(31) Some of the moderns are disposed to call in question this account of *Arius'* death; but without good reason, since it is attested by such unexceptionable witnesses as *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Athanasius*, and others. Yet the cause of his sudden and extraordinary death—for the miserable man is

said to have discharged his own bowels—is a subject of much controversy. The ancients, who tell us that God being moved by the prayers of holy men miraculously avenged the wickedness of the man, will hardly find credit at this day among candid persons well acquainted with Arian affairs. When I consider all the circumstances of the case, I confess that to me it appears most probable, the unhappy man lost his life by the machinations of his enemies, being destroyed by poison. An indiscreet and blind zeal in religion has, in every age, led on to many crimes worse than this. [“The preceding account of *Arius'* death and of the circumstances attending it, is given by *Athanasius*, (Ep. ad Serapion de morte Arian, p. 522, &c., Opp., tom. ii., ed. Commelin), by *Socrates*, (Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 37, 38), *Sozomen*, (Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 29, 30), by *Theodoret*, (Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 15), and by several other writers of the fourth century. The first in this list, and with him most of the others, draw a frightful picture of the manner of *Arius'* death, making him to have died by the falling out of all his bowels. Most of them regard it as a miracle, by which God punished him for his perjury, or hearkened to the prayers of bishop *Alexander*, who with others returned thanks to God for this deliverance. It is not strange that some moderns have moved the question, whether this whole narration, the chief source of which is found in the writings of the most strenuous opposer of *Arius*, and which respects a man then very much hated, may not be a fabrication. Yet the story is told with such uniformity as to the principal facts, by those who differ in the minor circumstances of it, and the spot where he died was so generally pointed out even in the fifth century, according to *Socrates*, that we are not authorized to doubt the truth of the general statement. Yet it can by no means be proved, nor indeed be made to appear probable, that the sudden death of *Arius* was miraculous, or a punishment inflicted by God. *Sozomen* himself tells us, that

§ 14. After the death of *Constantine* the Great, one of his sons, *Constantius* the emperor of the East, with his wife and his court, was very partial to the Arian cause; but *Constantine* and *Constans*, in the western parts where they governed, supported the decisions of the Nicene council. Hence there were no bounds and no end to the broils, the tumults, the conspiracies, and the wrongs; and councils were arrayed against councils by both the contending parties. *Constans* died in the year 350; and two years after, a great part of the West, particularly Italy and Rome, came under the dominion of his brother *Constantius*; and this change was most disastrous for the friends of the Nicene council. For this emperor, being devoted to the Arians, involved them in numerous evils and calamities, and by threats and punishments, compelled many of them, (and among others, as is well attested, the Roman pontiff *Liberius*, A.D. 357), to apostatize to that sect to which he was himself attached.(32) The Nicene party made no hesitation to return the same treatment, as soon as time, place, and opportunity were afforded them. And the history of Christianity under *Constantius*, presents the picture of a most stormy period, and of a war among brethren, which was carried on without either religion, or justice, or humanity.(33)

§ 15. On the death of *Constantius*, in the year 362, the prosperous days of the Arians were at an end. *Julian* had no partiality for either, and

some at the time regarded it as the consequence of a disease, which directly affected the heart; others believed, that his sudden joy at finding his affairs issuing so happily, brought on him this speedy death. Very much is requisite to justify the ascription of an event, which may be explained by natural causes, to a supernatural cause, or to the hand of God inflicting a divine punishment. But under such circumstances, Christians have in all ages been too ready to make up such inconsiderate judgments. Besides, the death of *Arms* is painted as being as extraordinary as possible; and it is not obscurely compared, by *Athanasius* in particular, with that of *Judas* the traitor; and on the other hand, the strange prayer of bishop *Alexander* against him, is not only passed without censure, but is represented as being a holy prayer which Heaven answered. The adherents of *Arius* maintained, that his enemies compassed his death by magical arts; and in very recent times, discerning writers have conjectured that he was poisoned. This however is merely a conjecture, and one which is often made on occasion of the sudden and unexpected death of persons who had many or powerful enemies. Nothing more, therefore, can be regarded as certain, than that *Arms* died a sudden death, but the cause of it is unknown" Translated from *Schroeckh*. *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. v., p. 386, 387.—*Tr.*]

(32) [It appears from the Letters of *Liberius*, which are still extant, and from the testimony of *Hilary* of Poitiers, *Jerome*,

and others, that *Liberius* boldly resisted the Arians, and was therefore banished to *Beroea* in *Thrace*; that, at the end of two years, his eagerness to return to his bishopric led him to consent to the condemnation of *Athanasius*, and to subscribe the Arian creed set forth by the third council of *Sirmium*. This weakness in a Roman bishop has furnished the Protestants with an argument against the Romish doctrine of papal infallibility, which they have not failed to urge successfully, and to the great annoyance of the Catholics. See, among others, *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, vol. i., p. 136, &c.—*Tr.*]

(33) [The orthodox and the Arians were constantly in the field, and they often came to bloodshed. The imperial brothers frequently patched up an external peace with each other; but the Christians, who from the principles of their holy religion should have been united in the closest bonds of brotherhood and in unbroken peace, were engaged in unceasing war, during the reign of these emperors. The victorious party bore down upon the vanquished with false accusations, banishments, deprivations of office, anathemas of councils, artifice and violence. For proof, the reader is referred to *Athanasius*, *Apolog. ad. Constant.*, p. 307, &c., and *Historia Arianor. ad Monach.*, p. 373, &c., p. 393, &c. *Sozomen*, H. E., lib. iv., c. 9, 19. *Soerates*, H. E., lib. ii., c. 37, and the dark picture of the state of the church, by *Vincentius Lerinensis*, in his *Commun.*, c. 6.—*Schl.*]

therefore patronised neither the Arians nor the orthodox.(34) *Jovian* [A.D. 363–364] espoused the orthodox sentiments; and therefore all the West, with no small part of the East, rejected Arian views, and reverted to the doctrines of the Nicene council.(35) But the scene was changed under the two brothers, *Valentinian* [in the West] and *Valens* [in the East], who were advanced to the government of the empire in the year 364. *Valentinian* adhered to the decisions at Nice; and therefore, in the West, the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, was wholly extirpated. *Valens* on the contrary, took sides with the Arians; and hence, in the eastern provinces, many calamities befell the orthodox.(36) But when this emperor had fallen in a war with the Goths, A.D. 378, *Gratian* [who succeeded *Valentinian* in the West in the year 376, and became master of the whole empire in 378], restored peace to the orthodox.(37) After him *Theodosius* the Gr., [A.D. 383–395], by depriving the Arians of all their churches, and enacting severe laws against them,(38) caused the decisions of the Nicene council to be everywhere triumphant; and none could any longer publicly profess Arian doctrines, except among the barbarous nations, the Goths,(39)

(34) [*Julian*, who wished to make himself popular, and to ruin the Christian church by its internal contests, not only gave all sects of Christians entire liberty of conscience, but recalled all the banished. And this was greatly for the advantage of the orthodox, especially in the West, where the churches again recovered their bishops, and such of them as had renounced orthodoxy through fear, returned again to the profession of it.—*Schl.*]

(35) [The Arians in the East, took great pains to draw *Jovian* over to their side; but as these attempts proved fruitless, various individuals of them, and in particular *Acaicius*, were induced to yield assent to the Nicene creed. The Arians of Alexandria also, in vain laboured to bring *Athanasius* into disgrace; but he was in high favour, till the emperor's death.—*Schl.*]

(36) [The persecution of *Valens* extended not only to the orthodox, but also to the *Semiarrians* and other minor parties; and the *Semiarrians*, after much negotiation, resorted to the unexpected measure of sending messengers to Rome, and by subscribing to the Nicene creed, attempted to form a coalition with the occidental Christians. But this coalition was frustrated, partly by the repugnance of some of the *Semiarrians* to the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and partly by the exertions of the powerful Arians at court, and a new persecution ensued. The orthodox ventured to make a representation to the emperor *Valens*, and for this purpose sent a delegation composed of 80 clergymen to the court at Nicomedia. The emperor cruelly ordered *Modestus* the prætorian prefect, to put them all to death, but without noise; which he accomplished by putting them on board a

vessel, and when at sea, causing the vessel and all the unhappy men to be burnt. Such cruelty, perhaps, is without a parallel among the persecutions by the pagans. See *Socrates*, H. E., iv., c. 15. *Sozomen*, H. E., vi., c. 13. *Theodoret*, H. E., iv., c. 21, and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 543, &c.—*Schl.*]

(37) [*Gratian* granted religious freedom to all his subjects, in the commencement of his reign, and excluded only the Manichæans, the Photinians, and the Eunomians from the liberty of holding assemblies for worship. He also recalled all the bishops whom *Valens* had banished. Some of the *Semiarrians* now again held their own synods, and renewed their confession of faith, that the Son is of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, in a council held at Antioch in Caria. On the other hand, the orthodox again set up public worship at Constantinople, and obtained the zealous *Gregory Nazianzen* for their bishop. *Gratian*, at length, forbid the assemblies of the heretics, without distinction. *Codex Theodos.*, l. v., de Hæret., and the Notes of *Gothofred*, tom. vi., p. 128. *Walch*, *Hist. der Ketz.*, vol. ii., p. 547, &c.—*Schl.*]

(38) See *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 5, 10, 130, 146, and *Gothofred*, Notes on these laws. [See also *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 549, &c.—*Schl.*]

(39) [The Goths were entangled in the Arian heresy on the following occasion. Being driven by the Huns from their former residence on the Tanais, they sent an embassy to the emperor *Valens*, and obtained liberty to plant themselves on the banks of the Danube; promising not only to serve the Romans in their wars, but to embrace

the Vandals,(40) and the Burgundians.(41) That there were great faults on both sides, in this long and violent contest, no candid person can deny; but which party was guilty of the greatest wrong, it is difficult to say.(42)

§ 16. The Arians would have done much more harm to the church, if they had not become divided among themselves after the Nicene council, and split into sects which could not endure each other. The ancients enumerate as Arian sects, the *Semiarrians*, the *Eusebians*,(43) the *Acitians*,

the Christian religion, as soon as teachers should be sent among them. *Ulphilas* was one of their ambassadors, who was himself an Arian, and *Valens* also gave him only Arian teachers for his assistants. It was not strange, therefore, that the Arian doctrine obtained so great currency among this people. The subsequent history of Arianism among them, is related by *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 553.—*Schl.*]

(40) [Neither the time nor the circumstances, in which this people embraced Christianity, can be ascertained. Only thus much is certain, that they were in great measure believers in Christianity before they came into France; (*Salvianus*, de Gubernatione Dei, lib. vii., p. 845 and 228). And from a passage in *Jornandes*, (de Rebus Geticis, c. 25), it is probable, that they got their first knowledge of Christianity from their neighbours the Goths, and according to the Arian principles. They were persecutors of the orthodox; which can not be said of the Goths. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 559, &c.—*Schl.*]

(41) [These first settled permanently in Gaul, during the next century, and there they first embraced the Christian religion, and according to the orthodox system. (*Orosius*, lib. viii., c. 32. *Socrates*, H. E., vii., 30, and the history of the fifth century, infra, pt. i., chap. i., § 4) But their intercourse with the neighbouring Arians, the West Goths, infected them with the leaven of Arianism. Yet under the successors of their king *Gundobald*, the orthodox doctrine again got the upper hand; and under the domination of the Franks, the adherents to Arian principles were wholly rooted out. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 564, &c.—*Schl.*]

(42) [The judgment pronounced by *Dr. Walch*, in the 2d vol. of his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, p. 698, is so sound and impartial, that I cannot refrain from inserting it here without alteration. "The modern Arians in England blacken the character of *Athanasius* too much, in order to discredit his doctrine: other writers, too much prepossessed with the idea that a kalendar saint must be an angel, represent this man and his adherents as absolutely faultless. If we

would judge impartially, both parties were chargeable with the dreadful consequences of this contest. There was a total want of moderation throughout; every where the mistaken notion reigned, that it is right to exercise control over the consciences of others; every where private matters were treated as public affairs of the church; every where the authority of ecclesiastical councils was misused; and still more, that of civil magistrates; every where therefore, a persecuting spirit was cherished and maintained. In particular, we believe that these faults commenced on the side of the orthodox; that other bishops too hastily became linked in with [the Constantinopolitan] *Alexander*; and that in the council of Sardica, too little respect was paid to the wishes of the Oriental bishops in respect to *Athanasius*, which were that he might not sit and vote in the council, because he was the accused person. But the Arians were guilty of still greater offences. *Arius* was in fault for so zealously endeavouring to create a party; but *Eusebius* of Nicomedia was, in our opinion, the real firebrand, which set the whole in a flame; and the suspicion, that pride and love of distinction led him to defend *Arius*, and produced that obstinacy in supporting the side he took, appears to us well founded. In short—this history very forcibly inculcates the necessity of uniting true benevolence towards men, with our zeal for the truth, and the avoiding of all personal animosities, by presenting to us so many lamentable occurrences and so very unhappy consequences, arising from the neglect of these Christian duties." *Walch*, ubi supra.—*Schl.*]

(43) [These derived their name from two bishops named *Eusebius*, the one of *Cæsarea*, and the father of church history, the other of *Nicomedia*, and afterwards of *Constantinople*, an intimate with *Constantine the Great*. These belonged to the class of *Semiarrians*, called at this day *Subordinationists*, because they maintained a *subordination* among the persons of the Godhead. Yet this name was applied to all who opposed the Nicene doctrine, and who disapproved either of the word *ὁμοούσιος* only, or also the idea it was used for.—*Schl.*]

the *Eunomians*, the *Acacians*, (44) the *Psathyrians*, (45) and others. But they may all be reduced to three classes. The first class embraces the old and *genuine Arians*; who, rejecting all new terms and modes of expression, taught explicitly, that the Son was *not begotten* by the Father, but was *created* or formed out of nothing. (46) From these, on the one side, deviated the *Semiarians*; and on the other, the *Eunomians* or *Anomoeans*, that is, the disciples of the acute *Eunomius*, and of *Aëtius*. The *former* class maintained, that the Son of God was *ὁμοούσιον*, i. e., of *like essence* with the Father; yet not by nature, but only by grace. The leaders of this party were *George* of Laodicea, and *Basil* of Ancyra. (47) The *latter*, who were also called pure Arians, *Aëtians* (48) and *Exucontians*, (49) contended,

(44) [These bore the name of *Acacius*, a bishop of Cæsarea and successor of *Eusebius Pamphilus*. He allowed that the Son was *like* the Father; but only in respect to his *will*.—*Schl.*]

(45) [This word imports *pastry-cooks*; because a person of this occupation, a Syrian named *Theoktistus*, was particularly zealous in defending one of the minor parties of Arians in Constantinople, which maintained that God the Father existed before the Son had a being.—*Schl.*]

(46) [*Arius* maintained that there were *three* substances in God, namely, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The *first* is the only eternal God. There is, absolutely, none like him; and his essence is incomprehensible. He is called the *Father*, in a sense corresponding with that in which the Son is called the *Son*; and as the latter was not always the Son, so the former was not always the Father. The *second* substance is the person, who in the scriptures is denominated the Son, the Word, and the Wisdom of God. He is absolutely a *creature* of God; and one whom God created, as he did the other creatures, immediately from nothing. This creation of the Son, the scriptures denominate a *generation*; and this creature is called the *Son* of God, in a figurative sense of the word, because God has *adopted* him. The terms *Word* and *Wisdom* of God, are ambiguous; for they sometimes denote certain powers or attributes of God, and sometimes a person, namely, the Son. In the former acceptation, they are inherent in God naturally, and necessarily, but not so in the latter acceptation. God, of his voluntary choice, produced this person, to be an instrument in his hand in the creation of the world. The Son therefore is, in his essence, totally different from the Father. As a rational creature, he possesses free will, is changeable, and so might become either vicious or virtuous; though by his diligence and his long practice, he has acquired permanent habits of virtue. And God has chosen for his Son,

this most virtuous of all the created spirits. Thus the Son, according to *Arius'* views, is not truly God, not eternal, not omniscient. Some things are mysteries to his understanding; and he does not comprehend clearly the essence of the Father, nor his own nature. Yet God has graciously imparted to him pre-eminent gifts. Thereby he has become the Son of God; nay, obtained for himself the name of *God*; though not in the proper sense of the word. Such is *Dr. Walch's* representation of the doctrine of *Arius*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ii., p. 589, &c.—*Schl.*]

(47) See *Prud. Maran*, Dissert. sur les Semiariens; which has been reprinted by *Joh. Voigt*, in *Biblioth. Haeresiolog.*, tom. ii., p. 119, &c. [The Semiarians were also called *moderate Arians*; and likewise *Eusebians*, because the *Eusebiuses*, especially the one of Cæsarea, supported this party; and *Homoeousians*, from the word *ὁμοούσιος*, which was, as it were, their symbol.—*George* of Laodicea, was a native of Alexandria, and a very learned man. He had personal difficulties with bishop *Alexander*, and obtained the bishopric of Laodicea, through the Eusebian party, to which he devoted himself. *Basil*, bishop of Ancyra, had the reputation of an upright and learned man, and was in great favour with the emperor *Constantius*. He can be taxed with no other fault, than that of not tolerating the word *ὁμοούσιος*. He drew on himself much persecution by his zealous opposition to *Photinus*, and to the genuine Arians; and was deprived of his office by the Acacians.—*Schl.*]

(48) [They had this name from their chief person, *Aëtius* of Antioch. This man applied himself to the sciences at Alexandria, and acquainted himself with the medical art, as well as with theology. As all his instructors were of Arian sentiments, he also applied his talents and his dexterity in debate to the vindication of the Arian doctrines. He was made a deacon at Antioch; but as the Semiarians and the orthodox hated him, he was deposed and banished, in the reign of

that Christ was *ἐτεροόσιον* or *ἀνόμοιον*, i. e., *dissimilar*, both in *essence* and in other respects, to the Father.(50) Under each of these classes, there were other subordinate sects, whose subtleties and refinements have been but obscurely developed by the ancient writers. This discord among the Arians was as injurious to their cause, as the confutations and the zeal of the orthodox.

§ 17. Unhappily the Arian contests, as was very natural, produced some new sects. Some persons, while eager to avoid and to confute the opinions of *Arius*, fell into opinions equally dangerous. Others, after treading in the footsteps of *Arius*, ventured on far beyond him, and became still greater errorists. The human mind, weak, powerless, and subject to the control of the senses and the imagination, seldom exerts all its energies to comprehend divine subjects, in such a manner as to be duly guarded against extremes. To the former class, I would reckon *Apollinaris* the younger, bishop of Laodicea, though otherwise a man of great merit, and one who in various ways rendered important service to the church.(51) He manfully asserted the divinity of *Christ*, against the Arians; but by philosophizing too freely and too eagerly, he almost set aside the human nature of the Saviour. He maintained, that Christ assumed only a human body, endowed with a sentient soul, but not possessed of intellect; and that the divine nature in Christ did the office of a rational soul or mind;(52) whence it seemed to follow, that the divine nature became mingled with the human,(53) and with the human nature suffered pain and death. This great

Constantius. *Julian* recalled him, and gave him a bishopric. He had the surname of the *Atheist*. *Socrates*, H. E., i., c. 35. *Sozomen*, H. E., iii., c. 15, &c., and iv., c. 23.—*Schl.*]

(49) [This name is derived from the Greek words *ἐξ ἐκ ὄντων*. They said, that the Son of God might indeed be called *God*, and the *Word of God*; but only in a sense consistent with his having been brought forth *ἐξ ἐκ ὄντων* [from nonexistences]; that is, that he was one of those things, which *once had no existence*; and of course, that he was properly a *creature*, and was once a *nonentity*.—*Schl.*]

(50) See *Ja. Basnage*, Diss. de Eunomio, in *Henr. Canisius*, Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. i., p. 172, &c., where are extant the creed and an apology of *Eunomius*. See also *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Gr., vol. viii., p. 100–148, and Codex Theodos., tom. vi., p. 147, 155, 157, 167, 200, &c. [*Eunomius*, a Cappadocian, was a scholar of *Aëtius*, and was made bishop of Cyzicum by his partisans. But he was soon displaced, and his whole life was full of unpleasant occurrences. He was peculiarly lucid in his style, and his writings are, on that account, the most valuable documents for the history of Arianism.—*Schl.* See note, p. 248.—*Tr.*]

(51) [See a sketch of his life and writings, above, p. 247, note (29).—*Tr.*]

(52) [*Apollinaris* believed that *Christ*

had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which the Saviour performed; and he could see no good reason why Christ must have had *two* intelligent natures and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as being the seat of sinful acts, must be liable to moral changes; and therefore that Christ, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is, a sinless human nature. And he supported his opinion by the many passages of scripture which speak of Christ's becoming man, in which only the word *σὰρξ* (*flesh*) is used for the human nature; e. g., Joh. i, 14. These arguments needed an answer; but his opposers replied to them very imperfectly. They showed indeed, from the Bible, that Christ had a rational human soul. But their proof was defective in this, that they did not show, that by the word *ψυχή* in the Scriptures must necessarily be understood a *rational* soul. And what they brought forward besides this, were either the bad consequences that would follow, or occasions for logomachy, which rather retarded than furthered the discovery of truth. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii., p. 186, &c.—*Schl.*]

(53) [This consequence, however, *Apollinaris* did not admit. He was indeed accused of denying the actual distinction of

man was led astray, not merely by the ardour of debate, but likewise by his immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine concerning a twofold soul; from which if the divines of that age had been free, they would have formed more wise and more correct judgments on many points. Some among the ancients attribute other errors besides this, to *Apollinaris*; but how much credit is due them is doubtful.(54) The doctrine of *Apollinaris* met the approbation of many, in nearly all the eastern provinces; and being explained in different ways, it became the source of new sects. But as it was assailed by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of learned men, it gradually sunk under these united assaults.

§ 18. To the same class must be reckoned *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia;(55) if confidence may be placed in *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, and in his other adversaries, who tell us that he so explained the mystery of the holy Trinity, as to fall into the Sabellian and Samosatene errors. Yet there are many who think, that both *Eusebius* of Nicodemia, and *Eusebius* of Cæsarea, unfairly represent his sentiments, because he gave of

the two natures, and of holding to such a confusion of them, as *Eutyches* afterwards maintained. But he rejected the term *mixture*; and expressly taught, that he did not subvert the doctrine of two distinct natures in *Christ*, but that the divinity remained divine, and the flesh remained flesh. See *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 193, &c. —*Schl.*]

(54) See *Ja. Basnage*, *Historia hæresis Apollinaris*; which is republished with learned additions, by *Jo. Voigt*, *Biblioth. Hæresiologicala*, tom. i., fascic. i., p. 1-96. See also *ibid.*, tom. i., fascic. iii., p. 607. The laws against the Apollinarians, are extant in the *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 144, &c. See likewise (*Chaufepie*), *Nouveau Dictionnaire hist et crit.*, tom. i., p. 304, &c. [“See an account of *Apollinaris*, and his heresy, in the English edition of *Bayle’s* Dictionary, at the article *Apollinaris*.”—*Macl.* Concerning this sect, *Dr. Walch* has treated most solidly, and with the application of impartial criticism, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 119-229.—*Schl.*]

(55) [This *Marcellus* was a person of weight in the Nicene council; and he there opposed the Arians with a zeal and energy which procured him praise from his own party, and hatred and obloquy from the opposite side. (See *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* lxxii., c. 2. *Athanasius*, *Apolog. contra Arian.*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 143, 150, and *Constantine*, *Epist. Pontiff.*, p. 379, 383.) *Asterius*, a defender of the Arian doctrine, attacked him in writing, and accused him of Sabellianism. *Marcellus* in reply wrote a book to defend the true doctrine respecting the subordination of Jesus Christ to the Father. He likewise discarded all the posi-

tions taken by the Arians in their councils; and this drew on him a severe persecution. In the year 336, the Arian bishops assembled at Constantinople deposed him, as one convicted of the Sabellian or Samosatene heresy, and elected *Basil* in his place. After the death of *Constantius*, he recovered his see; but lost it again almost immediately, as the Eusebians again got the ascendancy. He now fled to Rome, and exhibited a confession of his faith to the bishop *Julius*, by whom, with the other bishops of the Athanasian party assembled at Rome, he was recognised as orthodox, and as a sufferer for the truth. On the other hand, the eastern bishops persevered in their criminations of him. In the year 347, the western bishops at the council of Sardica, again pronounced him innocent. But when *Photinus*, a pupil of *Marcellus*, commenced his disturbance, *Athanasius* now first threw out some suspicions, that his doctrine was not pure; but he soon dropped them. *Basil* the Great, however, was more decided in his opposition to *Marcellus*, and held him to be actually a heretic. Yet he afterwards acknowledged himself in the wrong. *Marcellus* and his friends took pains to procure testimony, from influential men and from whole churches, to their orthodoxy; and they were not unsuccessful. *Marcellus* was in reality not without considerable learning; but his judgment was weak, and he had the habit of talking at random, and was at the same time very bitter against his antagonists. It is therefore, not only possible, but also very probable, that he often let drop faulty expressions, which in the view of his enemies contained dangerous errors. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 232, &c.—*Schl.*]

fence by the severity of his attacks upon the Arians and upon the bishops who favoured them. But admitting that his accusers were influenced in some respects by their hatred of the man, yet it is certain, that their accusations were not altogether groundless. For it appears from a careful examination of the whole subject, that *Marcellus* considered the Son and the Holy Spirit as two *emanations* from the divine nature, which, after performing their respective offices, were to return back into the substance of the Father: and whoever believed so, could not, without self-contradiction, hold the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to differ from each other in the manner of distinct persons. (56) *Marcellus* increased the odium and suspicions against him, by refusing, in the last years of his life, to condemn *Photinus* his disciple. (57)

§ 19. At the head of those whom the contests with *Arius* led into still greater errors, may undoubtedly be placed *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium, (58) who in the year 343, advanced opinions concerning God, equally remote from those of the orthodox and those of the Arians. On well considering what the ancients have stated without much perspicuity or uniformity, it appears, that he supposed *Jesus Christ* was born of the virgin *Mary*, by the Holy Spirit; that with this extraordinary man, a certain divine *emanation* which he called the *Word* became united; that, on account of this union of the *Word* with the man *Jesus*, he was called the *Son of God*, and also *God*, and that the Holy Spirit was a virtue or *energy* proceeding from God, and not a *person*. (59) The temerity of the man was chastised not

(56) [It is nevertheless uncertain, whether *Marcellus* really denied the personal distinctions in the Trinity. The accusations of his opposers are not credible evidence in this case. *Marcellus* and his friends constantly denied that they were Sabellians. He denied indeed, that there were three *ὑποστάσεις*, affirming that there was but *one ὑπόστασις*. But this word had then so indeterminate a meaning, that nothing certain can be inferred from it. For it denoted, sometimes what we should call *substance*, and at other times was equivalent to *person*. *Dr. Walch* (ubi supra, p. 290) thinks it probable, as *Marcellus* always strenuously contended, and with justice, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are *ἀδιαίρετος* and *ἀχωρίστος* (*inseparably*) united, he must have regarded the word *ὑπόστασις*, as equivalent to the phrase, *ὑποστάσις διεγώσα, a different substance*. Yet clearly he often used unsuitable descriptions and comparisons, respecting the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and such as seem to show, that he understood by these persons only certain attributes and acts of God. But perhaps these were only unfortunate expressions, or errors of the moment, from which he would give back when the heat of contest subsided.—*Schl.*]

(57) See *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, *Diatribæ de caussa Marcelli*; in the *Nova Collectio*

Patrum Græcor., tom. ii., p. li., &c. [re-published, with some notes, by *Voigt*, *Biblioth. Hæresiologicalæ*, vol. i., fascic. ii., p. 297.—*Schl.*], and *Ja. Gervaise*, *Vie de S. Epiphane*, p. 42, &c. [Add also, *Walch*, *Hist. der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 229–299, and *Chr. Hen. Vogel's* *Disputation at Göttingen*, 1757, de *Marcello Ancyrae Episcopo*.—*Schl.*]

(58) [Yet *Photinus* was not a native of Sirmium, as some have supposed, being misled by a faulty Latin version of a passage in *Epiphanius*, de *Hæres.* lxxi., § 1. He was rather a Galatian, (*Jerome*, de *Viris Illust.*, c. 107, and *Socrates*, *H. E.*, ii., c. 18), and most probably of Ancyra. He was an author; but his writings are lost. And he was eloquent, and had an excellent faculty of securing the affections and making proselytes among his hearers. See *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 9, &c.—*Schl.*]

(59) [To give a more distinct view of the opinions of *Photinus*, we will here state them, as they are arranged by *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit., p. 34. *Photinus* had (I.) erroneous views of the *Trinity*. On this subject, he taught thus: The Holy Scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but we are to understand by them, only *one person*, who in Scripture is called the Father. What the Scriptures call the *Word* of God, is by no means a substance

only by the orthodox, in their councils of Antioch A.D. 345, of Milan A.D. 347, and of Sirmium, (60) but also by the Arians, in a council held at Sirmium A.D. 351. He was deprived of his office, and died in exile in the year 372. (61)

§ 20. After him, *Macedonius* bishop of Constantinople, a distinguished Semiarian teacher, being deprived of his office through the influence of the Eunomians, by the council of Constantinople in the year 360, (62) in

or a person. Still less is it a person *begotten* by the Father, and therefore called the Son. For with God there can be no generation; and of course he can have no Son. Neither is the Word the person who made the world; but the Word is properly the *understanding* of God; which comprehends the designs of God, in all his external operations, and is therefore called God. The Holy Spirit also is not a person, but an attribute of God. Hence followed (II.) erroneous ideas of the *person of Christ*. He maintained, that Jesus Christ was a *mere man*; that before his birth, he had no existence, except in the divine foreknowledge; and that he began to *be*, when he was born of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Yet he received the special influences of divine power, whereby he wrought miracles. This is the indwelling of the Word. On account of these excellent gifts, and his perfect virtue, God took this man into the place of a son; and therefore he is called the *Son of God*, and also *God*. Therefore it must be said, that the Son of God had a beginning.—*Schl.*

(60) [Concerning the time and succession of these councils, there has been much debate between *Petavius*, *Sirmond*, *La Roque*, and others; of which an account is given by *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 5, &c. We will only add, in correction of *Dr. Moshcim's* statements, 1st, that the earliest of these councils was held in the year 343; as appears from three documents first brought to light by *Maffei*; and 2dly, that it was held by the *Semiarians*. So that the first orthodox council against *Photinus*, was that of *Milan*. In that of *Sirmium* the eastern bishops were assembled; and they pronounced *Photinus* a heretic. *Photinus*, when adjudged to be deprived of his office and sent into exile, made application to the emperor, and obtained leave publicly to defend his doctrine. *Basil*, bishop of *Ancyra*, was appointed to dispute with him, and a formal discussion took place. Both parties became angry. But the victory was adjudged to *Basil*; and the former decision was affirmed. See *Walch*, loc. cit., p. 51, &c.—*Schl.*]

(61) *Matth. de la Roque*, de *Photino ejusque multiplici damnatione*, Geneva, 1670,

Svo. *Tho. Ittig*, *Historia Photini*; in his *Heptas Dissertationum*, subjoined to his *Diss. de Hæresiarchis ævi Apostolici*. [We may add, *Petavius*, *Diss. de Photino hæretico*, ejusque damnatione; in his *Rationarium Temporum*, 3d edit., and among the *Opuscula of Peter de Marca*, [vol. v., p. 183, &c., ed. Bamberg, 1789; where it is accompanied with the two *Diatribæ of Sirmond*, respecting the councils of *Sirmium*]; and *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 1-70.—*Schl.*]

(62) [There were several persons of the name of *Macedonius*, who should not be confounded with this man. The most noted of them were, *Macedonius* of *Mopsueste*, a contemporary with our *Macedonius*, and also involved in the Arian contests: (*Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. 19): and *Macedonius*, likewise bishop of Constantinople in the reign of the emperor *Anastasius*, [A.D. 491-518], by whom he was banished for his zeal against the Eutycheans. The election of our *Macedonius* was attended with disorders which merit notice. This metropolis had had one *Paul* for its bishop, who was deposed by the emperor *Constantius*, and *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* was chosen in his place. After the death of *Eusebius*, the orthodox replaced *Paul* in his office; but the Eusebian bishops appointed *Macedonius*. The emperor *Constantius* was displeased with the movement of the orthodox, and ordered his general *Hermogenes* to drive *Paul* from the city. And as his adherents made opposition, and the general had to use force, there was a general insurrection, which cost both sides much blood. The orthodox populace set fire to the general's house, and dragged him about the streets, with a rope around his neck, and finally killed him. The emperor now came himself to Constantinople, drove *Paul* from the city, and punished the people. And he also refused to establish *Macedonius* in the office, because he had given occasion to the bloodshed: but he allowed him to remain in the city, and to hold worship in one of the churches which was assigned him. (*Socrates*, *H. E.*, ii., c. 13, and *Sozomen*, *H. E.*, iii., c. 8.) *Paul* returned again to Constantinople, and was again chased away by the soldiery; and on the other hand, *Macedonius* was in the year

his exile founded the sect of the *Pneumatomachi*. For he now openly professed, what he had before concealed, that the *Holy Spirit* is a *divine energy* diffused throughout the universe, and not a *person* distinct from the Father and the Son. (63) This doctrine was embraced by many in the Asiatic provinces. But the council of Constantinople, assembled by *Theodosius* the Great in the year 381, and which is commonly considered as the *second oecumenical* council, early dissipated by its authority this young and immature sect. One hundred and fifty bishops present in this council, defined fully and perfectly the doctrine of three persons in one God, as it is still professed by the great body of Christians, which the Nicene council had only in part performed. They also anathematized all the heresies then known; assigned to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the grandeur of the city over which he presided, a rank next after the bishop

342 reinstated by an imperial general; which occasioned another massacre, in which more than 3000 persons lost their lives. But as *Constantius* was compelled by his brother *Constans*, to reinstate the orthodox bishops, *Paul* shared in this good fortune, and *Macedonius* with his adherents had to content themselves with a single church to worship in. After the death of *Constans*, *Paul* was again displaced, and *Macedonius* once more seated in the episcopal chair. Here, confiding in the protection of the emperor, he stirred up a general persecution against the adherents to the Nicene creed, which extended to the provinces adjacent to Constantinople. (*Socrates*, H. E., ii., c. 26, 27, 38, and *Sozomen*, H. E., iv., c. 20, 26.) In the year 356, that church at Constantinople in which was placed the coffin of *Constantine* the Great, seemed ready to fall down; and *Macedonius* therefore would remove the coffin. Some, among whom were the orthodox, maintained that this removal was improper and irregular; being influenced partly by respect for the deceased emperor, and partly by hatred against *Macedonius*. But as *Macedonius* notwithstanding proceeded to the removal, and had brought the coffin into another church, the two parties came to blows in the latter church, and such a slaughter was there made, that the porch was filled with dead bodies. This unfortunate step drew upon *Macedonius* the emperor's displeasure. (*Socrates*, H. E., ii., c. 38. *Sozomen*, H. E., iv., c. 21.) About this time, the disagreement among the opposers of the Nicene faith, came to an open rupture; and *Basil* of Ancyra, the leader of the Semiarrians, drew *Macedonius* over to his party. (*Philostorgius*, Hist. Eccles., iv., c. 9.) From this time onward, *Macedonius* held a high rank among the Semiarrians, and supported their cause in the council of Seleucia. But he thus drew on him-

self such hatred from the whole Arian party, that they, in the year 360, with *Acacius* and *Eudoxius* at their head, deprived him of his office at Constantinople. *Macedonius* was very restless under this, and laboured to establish the Semiarrians by defending their opinions; and this gave occasion for the Semiarrians to be sometimes called *Macedonians*. He died soon afterwards. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii., p. 74, &c.—*Schl.*]

(63) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., i. iv., c. 4. [For a more full exhibition of the Macedonian doctrines, we will subjoin the statement of *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit., p. 96. As to their doctrine concerning the *Son of God*, some Macedonians agreed with the adherents to the Nicene fathers; but others, and among them *Macedonius* himself, coincided with the mildest form of the Semiarrian creed. In regard to the *Holy Spirit*, they departed wholly from the opinions of the orthodox. Some indeed did not declare themselves, in regard to the divinity of the *Holy Spirit*. They did not expressly deny that he was God; and yet they hesitated to affirm it. And this was no unusual thing. Even *Basil* the Great, would not recommend to have the name of *God* used of the *Holy Spirit* in public, nor condemn those who refused thus to use it. Nor would *Gregory* disapprove this. See *Petavius*, Dogma. Theolog., lib. i., de Trinitate, c. 10, tom. ii., p. 45, 64, and *Semler*, Einleitung zum 3ten Theil der *Baumgarten's* Polemik, p. 173, 183. Others who did declare themselves, affirmed that the *Holy Spirit* was not a *person* in the Godhead; that he was not, what the Father and the Son are; and therefore no divine honours were due to him. Some held the *Holy Spirit* to be a creature; and therefore did not deny his personality. Others denied his personality, and regarded him as a mere attribute of God.—*Schl.*]

of Rome ; and made such other regulations as the general interests of the church seemed to require.(64)

§ 21. The phrensy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often confuted, revived again in Spain. In the beginning of this century, one *Mark*, a native of Memphis, introduced it from Egypt, and communicated it first to a few individuals. It had proceeded considerable lengths, and had infected some persons in reputation for their learning and piety, when *Priscillian*, a man of birth, fortune, and eloquence, and afterwards bishop of Avila, imbibed it. Being accused by some bishops before the emperor *Gratian*, *Priscillian* and his followers were banished from Spain : but he returned soon after. Accused again in the year 384, before *Maximus*, (the usurper in Gaul, after the assassination of *Gratian*), he was condemned, with several of his associates, and executed at Treves in the year 385. The instigators of this capital execution for heresy were, however, regarded with abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy : for it was not yet considered among Christians as a pious and righteous act, to deliver heretics over to the civil power to be punished.(65) *Priscillian* being

(64) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. v., c. 8. *Sozomen*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 7. [The Macedonians led an externally good and strict life ; and by promoting monkery, they obtained such reputation for piety, agreeably to the taste of that age, as contributed much to their popularity in Constantinople and its vicinity. After their separation from the Arians, and after their attempt to unite themselves with the orthodox had failed, they spread themselves considerably, especially in Thrace, along the Hellespont, and in Phrygia. In the western provinces they were not found. At Constantinople, they had their own churches and bishops. Among the attempts to reclaim the Macedonians from their errors, the most noticeable was that of the second general council at Constantinople. The emperor *Theodosius* hoped they might be won over more readily than the Arians, because they differed less from the orthodox. He therefore called Macedonian bishops to the council. There were 36 of them present ; and much pains was taken to persuade them to embrace the Nicene decisions. But all efforts were vain ; they declared that they would sooner embrace the Arian than the Nicene faith. And hence their doctrine was opposed in this synod, by an addition made to the Nicene creed, and by expressed forms of condemnation. With these ecclesiastical weapons against the Macedonians, worldly ones were combined. In the statutes of the elder *Theodosius*, (Codex Theodos. de Hæreticis, leg. 11, 12, 13), they are mentioned by name ; and in those of the younger *Theodosius*, which are inserted in the Codex Theodosianus, (leg. 59, 60, 65), it will be seen, that they still existed, but could hold worship only in the principal cities. These civil regulations gave the ill-disposed bish-

ops too much liberty to manifest their persecuting spirit towards the Macedonians, and enabled them wholly to exterminate them, it would seem, under these emperors. See *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii., p. 70-118 ; and, respecting the council of Constantinople, his Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 224, &c. The decrees of this council are given in *Beveridge's* Pandectæ Canonum, tom. i., p. 85.—*Schl.* The first decree respects the creed, and anathemas ; the second, confines bishops to their provinces ; the third, gives the bishop of Constantinople the rank of second patriarch. The four remaining decrees are of less importance.—*Tr.*]

(65) See *Sulpitius Severus*, Hist. Sacra, l. ii., c. 46, 51, and Dialog. iii. de Vita Martini, c. 15. [*Priscillian* had ability to present his doctrine with so much dexterity and eloquence, that he gained many friends both among the high and the low ; and his sentiments were soon spread through all Spain. Among his adherents there were some bishops, particularly *Instantius* and *Salveianus*, and many ladies of respectability. *Hyginus* bishop of Corduba, who afterwards went over to the Priscillianists, was the first to oppose his doctrine ; and for this purpose made a representation of it to *Ilacius* the bishop of Merida, who by his rash violence against bishop *Instantius*, blew the fire of the Priscillianist war into a great flame. After many and long contests, a council was held at Saragossa in 380, at which the Priscillianist doctrine was condemned, and the bishops *Instantius* and *Salveianus*, with the laymen *Elpidius* and *Priscillian*, were excommunicated. This measure rendered the sect more resolute and determined ; and *Priscillian*, that he might be more safe, was

slain, his opinions were not at once suppressed, but spread far and wide in Spain and Gaul: and even in the sixth century, the *Priscillianists* caused much trouble to the bishops of those provinces.

§ 22. No one of the ancients has accurately described the doctrines of the *Priscillianists*; on the contrary, some of them have perplexed and obscured the subject. It appears however from authentic records, that the *Priscillianists* came very near in their views to the Manichaeans. For they denied the *reality* of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained that the visible universe was not the production of God, but of some demon or evil principle; preached the existence of *Aeons* or *emanations* from God; declared human bodies to be prisons for celestial minds, fabricated by the author of evil; condemned marriages; denied the resurrection of the body, &c. Their rules of life were very severe: for what many state concerning their flagitious and libidinous practices, rests on no credible testimony. That the *Priscillianists* used dissimulation, and eluded their enemies by deceiving them, is true; but that they regarded all kinds of lying and perjury as lawful, as is commonly reported of them, has not even the appearance of truth. (66)

raised by the party from a layman to a bishop of Avila.—The civil power was put in motion against the sect; and *Idacius* obtained from the emperor *Gratian* a decree, by which this sect, as well as others, was banished the country. This decree dispersed them for a time. The leaders of the party took their course towards Rome; and while passing through France, they seduced many, especially in Aquitain Gaul. Although they got no hearing at Rome, yet they found means to obtain a rescript from *Gratian*, by which the former decree was repealed, and these bishops were restored again to their offices. When *Maximus* had seized the government, he issued, at the instigation of *Idacius*, a command to the *Priscillianist* teachers, to appear before the ecclesiastical council of Bourdeaux. Here *Instantius*, who readily and frankly answered the interrogatories of the council, was deposed: but *Priscillian* appealed to the emperor. Bishop *Martin* of Tours, saw with concern a civil judge about to pass sentence in an ecclesiastical affair, and made representations on the subject to the emperor, who assured him that no blood should be shed. Yet the emperor was finally persuaded by some bishops, to commit the investigation of the subject to his minister of state *Ecodius*, a stern judge. He in the year 385, at Treves, put *Priscillian* to the rack, and extorted from him a confession that he had uttered impure principles, and held nocturnal meetings with base females, and prayed naked; and after the facts had been reported to the emperor, *Priscillian* and some of his adherents were put to death, and others were punished with banishment. This is the first instance of a

criminal prosecution for heresy. The *Priscillianists* regarded these executions as a martyrdom; while their opposers sought in this bloody way to exterminate them; and the emperor had it in contemplation to send military officers into Spain, with full power to search out the heretics, and deprive them of life and property. But here again bishop *Martin* showed himself in an amiable light. He repaired to Treves, and there made such representations as prevented the execution of the emperor's designs. Yet the people shed the blood of heretics in many places; and some bishops had such unchristian views as to approve of it. Yet others, on the contrary, disapproved of it, and had great disension with the former in regard to it. The *Priscillianists*, however, still continued to be numerous in Spain, especially in Galicia; and in the fifth century, when the irruption of the barbarians into Spain threw the ecclesiastical affairs into great disorder, it afforded this sect opportunity again to spread itself very much. And in the sixth century, *Aguirre* has inserted in the Concil. Hispan., tom. ii., p. 269, &c., a letter of *Montanus* bishop of Toledo in the year 527, from which it appears, that many persons of this sect then lived in Valencia; and in the year 561, a council was held against them at Braga. From this time onward, no more is heard of them; and they must either have gradually wasted away, or have sunk at once on the irruption of the Saracens. See *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iii., p. 387–430.—*Schl.*]

(66) See *Simon de Vries*, *Diss. critica de Priscillianistis*, Trajecti, 1745, 4to, in which the principal fault is, that he follows too

§ 23. To these larger sects, certain minor ones may be added. One *Audaus*, an honest man, and ejected from the church in Syria for too freely reproving the corrupt lives of the clergy, collected a congregation and became its bishop. Being banished by the emperor into Scythia, he went among the Goths and there propagated his sect with good success. As to the time when this sect arose, the ancients are not agreed. In some of their practices they deviated from other Christians, among which, this is especially noticed by the ancients, that contrary to the decree of the Nicene council, they celebrated the feast of Easter on the same day with the Jewish Passover. It is also said, that they attributed to the Deity a human form; and held some other opinions which were erroneous. (67)

closely *Beausobre's* History of the Manichees, taking every thing there asserted to be true. *Fran. Girvesii* Historia Priscillianistarum chronologica, Romae, 1750, 8vo. In *Angeli Calogerac* Opusculi scientifici, tom. xxvii., p. 61. &c., occurs; *Bachiarus* illustratus, seu de Priscilliania haeresi Diss., which however is less occupied in illustrating the affairs of the Priscillianists, than [the work of] *Bachiarus*, [a learned Spaniard, who composed a short treatise de *Fide*, first published by *Muratorius*, (Anecdota Latinarum, tom. ii.), and which some consider as a polemic tract against the Priscillianists. To these must be added *Walch*, loc. cit., p. 378-481.—To ascertain the real doctrines of the Priscillianists, is very difficult, and perhaps impossible. The quotation from an epistle of *Priscillian*, which *Orosius* has preserved, (in his *Commonitorium*, inter Opp. *Augustini*, tom. viii., p. 431), is so obscure, that it would be very natural to suppose, his contemporaries did not correctly understand him. Hence we cannot rely entirely on the testimony of the ancients, even if they appear to have been impartial writers. Still it appears unquestionable, that *Priscillian* embraced *Gnostic* and *Manichean* errors; that he misconstrued the Scriptures, and perverted them by allegorical interpretations; that he relied on apocryphal books, as of divine authority; that he believed in the eternity of matter, and held that the evil angels were not creatures of God; that he also believed the world was not the work of God, and that all changes in the material universe originated from the evil spirits. Concerning the soul, he taught that it is a particle of the divine nature, separated from the substance of God. The human body, as all other flesh, according to the Priscillianistic doctrine, came from the devil. And even the production of man, by the union of a soul with a body, was the work of evil spirits. They believed in an unconditional necessity for the changes a man undergoes, and which they ascribed to the influence of

the stars. They denied the personal distinction of the three persons in the Godhead. It is very probable, that they controverted the human nature of Christ; and it is still more probable, that they denied him a real body, than that they denied him a human soul. From these principles it would follow, that they did not believe in a resurrection of the body. The same principles led them to disapprove of marriage, and of the procreation of children; and to forbid the eating of flesh. Their moral principles were in general, strict, and tended to produce an ascetic life. And on this account, the accusation of shameless debauchery, brought against them by their adversaries, is very improbable. Whether they all held prevarication, lying, and perjury, to be allowable, even in cases where one's religion is to be avowed, is uncertain. Yet it is very certain that some of them held this dangerous principle; as for instance, *Dictinnius*, from whose book *Augustine* quotes the arguments used to justify lying, which he also confutes in his book de *Mendacio* ad Consent. Yet that *Priscillian* and his first set of followers did not think so, appears from their suffering martyrdom.—*Schl.*]

(67) *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxx., p. 811. *Augustine*, de Haeres., cap. l. *Theodoret*, Fabul. Haeret., lib. iv., c. 9, [H. E., iv., 10]. *Jo. Joach. Schröder*, Diss. de Audaeanis; which is in *Joh. Voigt's* Biblioth. Hist. Hæresial., tom. i., part iii., p. 578, [and *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzeren, vol. iii., p. 300-321.—The founder of this sect, is called both *Audius* and *Audacus*; and his followers are likewise called both *Andiani* and *Audacani*; and not unfrequently *Anthropomorphites*, because they were taxed with attributing to God a human form. *Audacus* was of Mesopotamia, and stood in high estimation among the Syrians, on account of his holy life, and his great zeal for the honour of God. The last was so great that he publicly punished his own brother; and he would not flatter the avaricious and

§ 24. To this century also, the Greeks and Orientals refer the origin of the sect called *Messalians* and *Euchites*; and indeed clear traces of them first appear in the latter part of this century, though their principles were much more ancient, and were known before the Christian era, in Syria, Egypt, and other countries of the East. These persons, who lived secluded from intercourse with the world in the manner of monks, derived their name from their *praying*. For they believed, that an evil demon naturally dwells in the mind of every man, which can be expelled no otherwise than by continual praying and singing: and that this demon being once expelled, the soul will return to God pure, and be again united to the divine essence, of which it is a fraction. To this leading principle, as may readily be supposed, they added many other strange notions, closely allied to the sentiments of the Minichaeans, and derived from the same source from which the Manichaeans derived their doctrines, namely, the Oriental philosophy. (68) In short, the Euchites were a sort of *mystics*

luxurious bishops, for which he endured persecution, hatred, and reproach. But he was undismayed, and bore it all with patience. Yet when at last the hatred of his enemies went so far as often to beat him and his friends, he separated himself from the church, (though, previously, some had refused him communion), formed a party and got himself ordained its bishop. This step made the separation complete; for it was contrary to all ecclesiastical law, which required at least *three* bishops to solemnize an ordination, and also forbid the ordination of any schismatical bishop. The orthodox bishops entered a complaint against him before the emperor, who banished him at an advanced age into Scythia. This occasioned his going among the Goths, and converting many of that nation to Christianity. He erected monasteries among them, recommended the monastic life, ordained bishops; and died before the general persecution by *Athanasius*. *Audacus* held a few errors. He believed that God possessed, not a perfect human *body* but a human *shape*, and of course the form of human *limbs*; and that the fashion of the human body was copied from the divine shape, to which the Scriptural term *image of God* is to be referred. In respect to worship his followers were strict *separatists*, and would not worship at all with those Christians who were of an irreligious life, or who held church communion with the irreligious. Nay, they discarded the name of *Christians*, for that of *Audaceans*; because many of them had abused the name of *Christians*, in order to secure their safety. In regard to the feast of Easter, they were *Quartodecimanians*; that is, they kept this festival at the time the Jews did; and they defended the practice, by appealing to the Apostolical Constitutions. They held apocryphal books, and had their own system of church discipline. In gen-

eral it may be said, they were rather *fanatics* than proper heretics. Their errors were proof rather of a weak head than of a perverse heart; and their defence of their errors and contempt for other Christians were the effects of their [religious or] fanatical pride.—*Schl.*

(68) *Epiphanius*, Haeres. lxxx., p. 1067. *Theodoret*, Haeret. Fabul., lib. iv., c. 10, [and H. E., iv., 11]. *Timotheus* Presbyter, de Receptione Haereticor. in *Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Eccles. Graecae*, tom. iii., p. 403, &c. *Ja. Tollius*, Insignia Itineris Italici, p. 110, &c. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 128, tom. iii., part ii., p. 172, &c., and others: [in particular, *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. iii., p. 481–536. The names *Messalians* and *Euchites* signify *prayers* or *praying brethren*. The first is Syriac [or Aramaic, from the root עָרַב, *oravit*, whence the participle עָרַבִּים, *prccantes*, *Ezra*, vi., 10.—*Tr.*], and the latter is Greek, [Ἐυχισταί or Ἐυχιστῆς, from *εὐχή*, *oratio*. See *Suicer*, Thesaur. Eccles., tom. i., p. 1285, &c., and *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccles., iv., c. ii.—*Tr.*]. They were so called, because they believed the essence of religion to consist in prayer; that is, in that tranquil state of mind, in which a person neither thinks nor has volitions. They were also called *Enthusiasts*, because they pretended to be inspired and to hold converse with the Holy Spirit; *Choreutae* (χορευταί, *dancers*), from the motion of their bodies which they commonly used; the *spiritual* (πνευματικοί), which was the name they gave to themselves; also *Iamperetians*, *Adelphians*, and *Marcanists*, from certain of their leaders. There were both pagan and Christian Messalians. The former acknowledged indeed a plurality of Gods, yet they worshipped but *one* whom

who, according to the Oriental notion, imagined that two souls resided in man, the one *good* and the other *evil*; and who laboured to expedite the return of the former to God, by contemplation and prayer. This sect drew over many to its ranks by its outward show of piety, and the Greeks waged war with it, through all the subsequent centuries. Yet it should be remembered, that the names *Messalians* and *Euchites* were used with great latitude among the Greeks and the Orientals, and were applied to all who endeavoured to raise the soul to God by recalling it from all influence of the senses, though these persons often differed very materially in their religious opinions.

§ 25. Towards the close of this century, Arabia and the adjacent countries were disturbed by two opposite sects, the *Antidico-Marianites* and the *Collyridians*. The former contended, that the virgin *Mary* did not remain always a virgin; but that she had intercourse with her husband *Joseph*, after the birth of our Saviour. The latter, whom the ladies especially favoured, went to the opposite extreme: they worshipped *St. Mary* as a goddess, and thought she ought to be honoured and appeased with libations, sacrifices, and offerings of *cakes* [*κολλυρίδες*, in Latin *collyridae*].(69) The more obscure and unimportant sects, I pass without notice.

they called *ὁ παντοκράτωρ* the *Almighty*. These were more ancient than the Christians, built houses for worship similar to the Christian churches, and assembled morning and evening with many torches and candles, and employed their time in praising God; whence they were called *Euphemites*. The Christian Messalians were so named from the coincidence of their practice with that of the pagans: they seem to be the offspring of monkish enthusiasm, and to have first appeared in Mesopotamia, and thence to have spread into Syria; but their origin cannot be traced with more particularity. They seem not to have been a party who had determinate, fixed principles of faith peculiar to themselves. Their number also appears never to have been great. They were all *ascetics*, though they were not all *monks* in the proper sense of the word. Their religious theory was founded on an impure *mysticism*, like to what is common to nearly all fanatical persons and communities, and which originated, like the system of *Manes*, from the principles of the Oriental philosophy. Yet the Messalians, like all enthusiasts, appear to have relied more upon spirits, apparitions, and revelations, than upon the Oriental system of metaphysics. Their principles did not necessarily lead to vicious conduct; yet they might afford occasion for practising vice. And in fact there were among them many vicious persons, whom idleness and spiritual pride led into gross offences. And there were not wanting among them real villains, who abused the mystical stupidity of others, to subserve their own

wicked purposes. Heretics in the strict sense, they were not; although led astray by their pernicious mysticisms, they embraced wrong fundamental principles in regard to practical and experimental religion; and actuated by these, they at least in part fell into heretical opinions.—*Schl.*]

(69) See *Epiphanius*, *Haeres.* lxxviii., lxxix., p. 1033 and 1057. [Among the moderns, *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzerzeu*, vol. iii., page 577, &c. *Dr. Walch* makes mention, (*loc. cit.*, p. 598), of one *Bonosus*; concerning whom he also published a dissertation at Gottingen, 1754, de *Bonos* haeretico. This *Bonosus* was probably bp. of Sardica in Illyricum, near the end of this century. He was accused of maintaining, that *Mary* did not always remain a virgin, but bore several children. And this charge seems not to have been a false one. [See *Sirici*, Ep. 9, ad Anys., &c., inter *Epist. Ambrosii*, ep. 79, (s. 5).—*Tr.*] But whether *Bonosus* denied also the divinity of Christ, and taught that he was the Son of God only by adoption, is very dubious. Yet so much is certain, that in the fifth and sixth centuries, there were opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the divinity of Christ, who in France and Spain were known by the name of *Bonosians*. But still, it is uncertain whether they derived the name from this or from some other *Bonosus*. The reader may consult *Ittig's Supplementum operum Clementis Alexandrini*; where, in the annexed *Fascic. Observat. miscellan.* ad *Hist. Eccles.*, p. 242, there is an Essay, de *Haeresi Bonosi*.—*The Collyridianae* (for

CENTURY FIFTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. State of the Roman Empire.—§ 2. Farther Decline of Idolatry.—§ 3. Nations converted to Christianity.—§ 4. Conversion of the German Nations.—§ 5. The Franks.—§ 6. The Irish.—§ 7. Causes of these Conversions.

§ 1. To understand the causes which affected the condition of Christians in this century, it is necessary to keep in view some part of the civil history of the period. We shall therefore first observe concisely, that the Roman empire at the commencement of this century was divided into two parts, one of which embraced the eastern, and the other the western provinces. *Arcadius*, the emperor of the East, resided at Constantinople. *Honorius*, who governed the West, lived at Ravenna in Italy. The latter, distinguished by nothing but the mildness of his disposition, was negligent of the affairs of the empire. Hence first the Goths repeatedly laid waste Italy, and plundered Rome in a distressing manner. And this first defeat of the Romans was followed by others still more grievous, under the succeeding emperors. For the ferocious and warlike people of Germany overran those fairest provinces of Europe, Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and set up new kingdoms in them. At last the Heruli in the year 476, under *Odoacer* their chief, having vanquished *Romulus Augustus*, who is commonly called *Augustulus*, overturned the empire of the West, and brought Italy under their subjection. Sixteen years after, *Theodoric* king of the Ostrogoths settled in Illyricum, invaded these un-

Epiphanius makes them all females) were women, who carried their respect for the mother of Jesus so high, that they were justly charged by the orthodox fathers with superstition and idolatry. They came from Thrace and the yet more distant regions of Scythia into Arabia. It was their practice to dress out a car, or a square throne (*κερικον*), spread over it a linen cloth, and on a clear day, once a year, place on it during the day a loaf of bread, or a cake (*κολλυρίς*), which they offered to the virgin *Mary*. *Dr. Mosheim* (in his Lectures) considered them as a set of simple persons, who had considerable heathenism about them; and he supposed this offering of a cake was derived

from paganism. While they were mere pagans, they were accustomed to bake and present to the goddess *Venus*, or *Astarte* (the Moon), certain cakes which were called *collyrides*. And when they became Christians, they thought this honour might now be best shown to *Mary*. The doctor had in his eye perhaps, a passage in Jeremiah (viii., 18), where the prophet speaks of such a sort of worship: and in general, it is well known that the offering of cakes in the pagan worship was a customary thing. See *Dr. Walch*, loc. cit., p. 625, &c., and *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Eccles., tome xii., p. 83.—*Schl.*]

welcome intruders, by the authority of the Greek emperor, and vanquished them; in consequence of which, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths was established in Italy, in the year 493, and continued with various fortune till the year 552.(1) These new kings of the West professed to respect the authority of the emperors resident at Constantinople, whom they acknowledged as sovereigns over them; but in reality they were quite independent, especially *Theodoric* in Italy, a man of distinguished abilities, and they left nothing to the emperors but the shadow of supremacy.(2)

§ 2. Amid these wars and the dreadful calamities they produced, the cause of Christianity suffered much. Yet the Christian emperors, especially those of the East, continued their efforts to extirpate what remained of the ancient idolatry. In particular, *Theodosius* the younger [A.D. 408–450] has left us striking proofs of his zeal in this matter; for we have still extant various laws of his, requiring the idolatrous temples to be utterly destroyed, or to be dedicated to *Christ* and the saints, abrogating the pagan ceremonies and rites, and excluding the adherents to paganism from all public offices.(3) Yet in the western parts, the efforts of this kind were somewhat less; and we therefore find the Saturnalia, the Lupercalia, the gladiatorial shows, and other idolatrous customs observed with impunity both at Rome and in the provinces, and men of the highest rank and authority publicly professing the religion of their ancestors.(4) But by degrees this liberty was confined to narrower limits, and those spectacles which were most inconsistent with the sanctity of the Christian religion were every where suppressed.(5)

§ 3. The limits of the Christian church were extended, both in the East and in the West, among the tribes addicted to idolatry. In the East, the inhabitants of the two mountains Libanus and Antilibanus, being extremely annoyed by wild beasts, sought aid against them from the famous *Simcon Stylites*, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. *Simcon* told them, that their only remedy was to forsake their ancient superstitions and embrace Christianity. These mountaineers obeyed the counsel of the holy

(1) For a fuller account, see the Abbé *de Bos*, *Histoire Critique de la Monarchie François*, tom. i., p. 558, &c., and *Jos. Ju. Mascoo's* History of the Germans, written in German. [Also *Edu. Gibbon's* History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 29–31, 33–36.—*Tr.*]

(2) *Car. du Fresne*, Diss. xliii. ad. Histor. Ludovici S., p. 280. *Muratori*, Antiq. Ital., tom. ii., p. 578, 832, and Annal. Italiae: *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, tom. i., p. 207. *Joh. Cuchiaei*, Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum regis, with the observations of *Joh. Peringskiöld*, Stockholm, 1699, 4to.

(3) See Codex Theodes., tom. vi., p. 327, 331, &c.

(4) See *Macrobius*, Saturnalia; in particular, lib. ii., p. 190, ed. Gronovii: *Scipio Maffei*, delli Anfitrati, lib. i., p. 56, 57. *Pierre le Brun*, Histoire critique des pratiques superstitieuses, tom. i., p. 237, and others; but especially *Bernh. de Montfaucon*, Diss. de moribus tempore Theodosii M. et Arcadii ex Chrysostomo; which is

found in Latin, in the Opp. Chrysostomi, tom. xi., and in French, in the Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres, tom. xx., p. 197, &c. [The pagans traced the calamities of the empire to the prevalence of Christianity. Therefore in the year 408, at the instigation of the Tuscan soothsayers, idolatrous sacrifices were again established at Rome, in order to procure success against Alaric; and the existing bishop, *Innocentius*, who was apprized of the measure, allowed it to take place, if we may believe *Zosimus*, on condition that the sacrifices should be offered without noise. See *Zosimus*, lib. v., cap. 41.—To confute this accusation of the populace against Christianity, was the design of *Augustine's* twenty-two Books de Civitate Dei, addressed to *Marcellinus*.—*Schl.*]

(5) Near the close of the century, *Anastasius* in the East, prohibited the combats with wild beasts, and the other shows. See *Jos. Simon Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 268, 272.

man; and having become Christians, they saw the wild beasts flee from the country—if writers tell us the truth. The same *Simeon*, by his influence, (for I doubt the existence of any miracle), caused a part of the Arabians to adopt the Christian worship.(6) In the island of Crete, a considerable number of Jews, finding that they had been basely imposed upon by one *Moses* of Crete, who pretended to be the Messiah, voluntarily embraced Christianity.(7)

§ 4. The German nations who rent in pieces the western Roman empire, were either Christians before that event, as the Goths and others, or they embraced Christianity after establishing their kingdoms, in order to reign more securely among the Christians. But at what time, and by whose instrumentality, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alans, and some others became Christians, is still uncertain, and is likely to remain so. As to the Burgundians, who dwelt along the Rhine and thence passed into Gaul, it appears from *Socrates*,(8) that they voluntarily became Christians, near the commencement of the century. Their motive to this step was the hope that *Christ*, or the God of the Romans, who they were informed was immensely powerful, would protect them from the incursions and the ravages of the Huns. They afterwards [about A.D. 450] joined the Arian party; to which also the Vandals, Suevi, and Goths were addicted. All these warlike nations measured the excellence of a religion by the military successes of its adherents, and esteemed *that* as the best religion, the professors of which were most victorious over their enemies. While therefore they saw the Romans possessing a greater empire than other nations, they viewed *Christ*, the God of the Romans, as the most worthy of their homage.

(6) *Jos. Sin. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana, tom. i., p. 246, &c.

(7) *Socrates*, Hist. Eccles., l. vii., c. 38, [where the account is, in brief, that in the time of *Theodosius* the younger, an impostor arose, called *Moses* Cretensis. He pretended to be a second *Moses*, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them obeyed and perished in the waters, and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces; but he escaped them, and was seen no more. Likewise in the island of *Minorca*, many persons abandoned Judaism. Yet their conversion does no great honour to the Christians; for it was in consequence of great violence done to the Jews, of levelling their synagogue with the ground, and taking away their sacred books. See the account of their conversion, by the bishop of the Balearian Islands: *Sverus*, Epist. enyel. de Judaeorum in hac insula conversione et de miraculis ibidem factis; published from a MS. in the Vatican library, by *Baronius*, in his *Annales Eccles.* A.D. 418, and abridg-

ed by *Fleury*, Histoire de l'Eglise, liv. xxiv. Yet it is certain, that the Jews even in that age often imposed on the Christians, by pretending to have favourable views of Christianity. This appears from the Codex *Theodos.*, lib. xvi., tit. 8, leg. 23. And *Socrates*, (Hist. Eccles., l. viii., c. 17), mentions a Jew, who received baptism with a considerable sum of money, successively, from the orthodox, from the Arians, and from the Macedonians, and finally applying to the Novatians for baptism, was detected by the miracle of the disappearance of the water from the font. Although this miracle may be doubted, and the impostor may have been detected by an artifice of the Novatian bishop, yet it appears from the story, that what is practised by many Jews at the present day is no new thing.—*Schl.*]

(8) Hist. Eccles., lib. vii., c. 30. [They sent for a bishop from Gaul, who directed them to fast seven days, and baptized them on the eighth. *Dr. Semler* (in his Hist. Eccles. Selecta Capita, tom. i., p. 203) supposes this event took place about the year 415. And in this year it was, according to the *Chronicon* of *Prosper*, that the Burgundians took possession of a part of Gaul on the Rhine, with the consent of the Romans and their confederates, having promised to embrace Christianity.—*Schl.*]

§ 5. It was this motive which produced the conversion of *Clovis*, [*Chlodoveus*, *Hludovicus*, *Ludovicus*], or *Lewis*, king of the *Salii*, (a tribe of the Franks), who conquered a large part of Gaul, and there founded the kingdom of the Franks, which he endeavoured to extend over all the Gallic provinces; a valiant prince, but cruel, barbarous, selfish, and proud. For in the year 496, in a battle with the Allemanni at Tolbiacum, (9) when his situation was almost desperate, he implored the aid of *Christ*, whom his wife *Clotildis*, a Christian and daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had long recommended to him in vain; and he made a vow, that he would worship *Christ* as his God, provided he obtained the victory. Having become victorious, he stood to his promise, and in the close of that year was baptized at Rheims. (10) Some thousands of Franks followed the example of their king. It has been supposed that, besides the exhortations of his wife, the expectation of an extension of his dominions, contributed to induce him to renounce idolatry for Christianity; and it is certain, that his professing Christianity was very subservient to the establishment and enlargement of his kingdom. The miracles reported on this occasion are unworthy of credit; in particular, that greatest of them, the descent of a dove with a vial full of oil, at the baptism of *Clovis*, is either a fiction, or, as I think more probable, a *deception* craftily contrived for the occasion. (11) For such pious frauds were much resorted to in that age, both in Gaul and Spain, in order to captivate more readily the minds of the barbarous nations. It is said, that the conversion of *Clovis* gave rise to the custom of addressing the French monarchs with the titles of *most Christian Majesty*, and *Eldest Son of the Church*: (12) for the kings of the other barbarous nations which occupied the Roman provinces, were still addicted to idolatry, or involved in the errors of Arianism.

(9) [*"Tolbiacum* is thought to be the present *Zulpick*, which is about 12 miles from Cologne."—*Macl.*]

(10) See *Gregory of Tours*, *Historia Francor.*, l. ii., c. 30, 31. *Henry Count de Bunau*, *Historia imperii Romano-Germanici*, tom. i., p. 588, &c. *Abbé de Bus*, *Histoire critique de la monarchie Française*, tom. ii., p. 340, &c., [and *J. G. Walch*, *Dissert. de Clodoveo M. ex rationibus politicis Christiano*, Jena, 1751.—*Schl.* *Clovis*, once hearing a pathetic discourse on the sufferings of *Christ*, exclaimed: *Si ego ibidem cum Francis meis fuisset, injurias ejus vindicasset: Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs.* See *Fredегarius*, *Epitom.*, c. 21. *Aimoin*, l. i., c. 16, and *Chronicon St. Dionysii*, l. i., c. 20.—*Tr*]

(11) Against this miracle of the vial, *Joh. Jac. Chifflet* composed his book, *de Ampulla Rhemensi*, Antw., 1651, fol. The reality of the miracle is defended, among many others, by the *Abbé Vertot*, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscript. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. iv., p. 350, &c. After considering all the circumstances, I dare not call the fact in question. But I suppose, *St. Remigius*, in order to

confirm the wavering mind of the barbarous and savage king, artfully contrived to have a dove let down from the roof of the church bearing a vial of oil, at the time of the king's baptism. Similar miracles occur in the monuments of this age.—[The possibility of the event is made conceivable in this way. Yet there still remain weighty historical objections to the reality of the fact. The story rests solely on the authority of *Hincmar*, a writer who lived 300 years after the time. *Avitus*, *Anastasius*, and even *Gregory of Tours*, and *Fredегarius* are wholly silent on the subject. Besides, *Hincmar's* narrative contains the improbable circumstance, that the clergy who should have brought the oil that was wanting, could not get near the font, on account of the pressure of the crowd; but as anointing with oil was then practised at every person's baptism, it is improbable that on so solemn an occasion as this, due preparation for this part of the service would have been neglected.—*Schl.*]

(12) See *Gabr. Daniel's* and the *Abbé de Camp's* *Diss. de titulo Regis Christianissimi*; in the *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243, 404–448, 536. *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript.*, tome xx., p. 466, &c.

§ 6. *Cælestine* the bishop of Rome, first sent into Ireland to spread Christianity among the barbarians of that island, *Palladius*, whose labours were not crowned with much success. After his death, in the year 432, *Cælestine* sent *Succathus* a Scotchman, whose name he changed to *Patricius* [*Patrick*], a man of vigour and, as appears from the event, not unfit for such an undertaking. He was far more successful in his attacks upon idolatry; and having converted many of the Irish to Christianity, he in the year 472 established at *Armagh* the see of an archbishop of Ireland. (13)

(13) See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii, p. 517, tom. iii., Februar., p. 131, 179, &c. *Jac. Waræus*, *Hibernia Sacra*, p. 1, &c., Dublin, 1717, folio. The same *Ware* published the *Opuscula Sti. Patricii*, with notes, London, 1656, 8vo. The *synods* held by St. Patrick, are given by *Duv. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, tom. i., p. 2, &c., [and thence republished in *Harduin's* Collection, tom. i., p. 1790, &c.] Concerning the famous cave, called the *purgatory of St. Patrick*, see *Peter le Brun*, *Histoire critique des pratiques superstitieuses*, tome iv., p. 34, &c. [A minute account of *St. Patrick* and his labours in Ireland, is given by archbishop *Usher*, *Ecclesiæ Britannicæ Primordia*, cap. xvii., p. 815, &c., and a more neat and succinct account by *Adr. Baillet*, *Vies des Saints*, tom. i., March 17, p. 215, &c. According to the latter, St. Patrick was born near *Dunbriton* in Scotland, about A.D. 377. At the age of 16 he was seized by some Irish marauders and sold as a slave in Ireland. After five or six years' captivity, he escaped and returned to Scotland. His thoughts were at that time turned towards efforts for the conversion of the pagan Irish. After a few months, he set out with his parents for *Bretagne* in France. On the way, his father and mother both perished; and he himself was twice made a prisoner, first by the Picts, and then by pirates who carried him to *Bordeaux* and sold him. Being set free, he repaired to the monastery of *Marmoutier*, became a monk, and after three years' study determined to return to Scotland and become a missionary. But meeting obstructions on his way, he returned to France, and from there went to Italy, where he spent nearly seven years in different monasteries and holy places, was ordained a priest, and resided three years with the bp. of Pisa. Still thirsting for the conversion of the Irish, he repaired to Ireland and began to preach to those pagans. But meeting with no success, he was led to question his call to such a work; and he returned to France to consult his friends. He remained at *Auxerre* six years, and then passed nine years in the monastery at *Lerins*. At length in the year 432, by the recommendation of St. Germain bp. of *Aux-*

erre, he was appointed to succeed *Palladius* in the Irish mission, ordained by *Clement I.*, and sent forth by *Sixtus III.*, with a competent number of assistants. He passed through *Auxerre*, and after making some converts in *Wales* and *Cornwall*, landed on the coast of Ireland the same year. He commenced his missionary labours in *Lagenia*, a province in the north of Ireland; and his preaching being accompanied by apparent miracles, his success was very great. In 434, leaving that province to the care of his assistants, he passed into the province of *Ultonia*, where he was equally successful, founded a monastery near the city of *Down*, built many churches, and ordained many bishops and priests. Wherever he went new converts flocked to him, casting away their idols and demolishing their temples. But his old master *Milcon* he could not convert; and judgment overtook the wretch for his hardness, for his house took fire, and he with his whole family were burned up in it. In 436, Patrick left *Ultonia*, and proceeded to *Media* (*Meath*) and *Connacia* (*Connaught*); and for several years he travelled on foot from place to place, slept on the ground, and toiled incessantly to spread the gospel in all parts of the island. In the year 444, he made a journey to *Rome*, to confer with the pope and obtain more assistants. On his return the next year, he spent some time in the west of England, and, as some say, established there several monasteries. Re-entering Ireland with a large re-enforcement of priests, whom he distributed in the provinces of *Lagenia*, *Media*, and *Connacia*, he took his station in *Ultonia*, and there erected the church of *Armagh* about the year 450. To obtain more labourers, he passed over to Britain, and while there reclaimed many *Pelagians* and *Arians*. A great number of priests accompanied his return, whom he distributed in Ireland and the adjacent islands. He himself, it is said, spent some years in the province of *Momonica*, in which *Cashel* was a chief town. In 455 he again visited *Rome*, and was constituted abp. of *Armagh* and primate of all Ireland. In 456 he held the first Irish council, at which *Auxile* and *Wernin* appeared prominent among the bishops. From this time onward, being

Hence *St. Patrick*, although there were some Christians in Ireland before his day, has been justly called the *Apostle of Ireland* and the father of the Irish church, and is held in high veneration to this day.

§ 7. The causes which induced all these pagan nations to abandon the religion of their ancestors and profess Christianity, may be gathered from what has been already said. The man must lack discernment, who can deny that the labours, the perils, and the zeal of great and excellent men, dispelled the clouds of darkness from the minds of many; and on the other hand, he must be short-sighted and not well versed in the history of this age, who is unable to see, that the fear of the vengeance of man, the hope of temporal advantages and honours, and the desire of obtaining aid from Christians against their enemies, were prevalent motives with many to abandon their gods. How much influence *miracles* may have had, it is difficult to say. For I can easily believe, that God was sometimes present with those pious and good men, who endeavoured to instil the principles of true religion into the minds of barbarous nations: (14) and yet it is certain, that the greatest part of the prodigies of this age are very suspicious. The greater the simplicity and credulity of the multitude, the more audacious would be the crafty in playing off their tricks: (15) nor could the more discerning expose their cunning artifices, with safety to their own lives and worldly comfort. (16) It is commonly the case, that when great danger attends the avowal of the truth, then the prudent keep silence, the multitude believe without reason, and the architects of imposition triumph.

infirm from age and excessive toil, *St. Patrick* led a more stationary life at Armagh and at his favourite monastery of Sabhull near Down. Yet he preached daily, superintended the affairs of all the churches, held a council annually, laboured to civilize the nation, imparted to them letters, and performed every duty of a good shepherd, till, worn out with age and toil, he died about A.D. 460, at the age of 83. Some however, by placing his birth earlier and his death later, make his mission to continue 60 years, and his whole life 120, and some even 132 years. He is said to have erected 365 churches, consecrated almost as many bishops, and to have ordained nearly 3000 priests. He was buried in his monastery near Down; and miracles are said to have occurred at

his tomb. Such is the account of the Romish writers.—See *Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. ii., pt. i., p. 259–267.—*Tr.*]

(14) There is a remarkable passage concerning the miracles of this century, in the *Theophrastus*, seu de immortalitate animae, of the acute *Æneas Gzæus*, p. 78, ed. Barthii. Some of these miracles, he tells us, he himself had witnessed, p. 80, 81.

(15) The Benedictine monks speak out freely on this subject, in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 33. It is a fine saying of *Livy*, *Histor.*, lib. xxiv., c. 10, § 6: Prodigia multa nuntiata sunt, quae quo magis credebant simplices ac religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.

(16) *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial.* i., p. 438, *Ep.* i., p. 457. *Dial.* iii., cap. ii., p. 487.

CHAPTER II.

THE CALAMITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The Evils suffered by the Christians in the Roman Empire.—§ 2. Attempts of the Pagans against them.—§ 3. Their Persecutions.—§ 4. In Persia.—§ 5. Individual Enemies of Christianity.

§ 1. It has been already observed that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, the Vandals, and other fierce and warlike nations, who were for the most part pagans, had invaded and miserably rent asunder the Roman empire. During these commotions, the Christians at first suffered extremely. These nations were, it is true, more anxious after plunder and dominion, than for the propagation of the false religions of their ancestors, and therefore did not form any set purpose to exterminate Christianity; yet the worshippers of idols, who still existed everywhere scattered over the empire, neglected no means to inflame the barbarians with hatred against the Christians, hoping by their means to regain their former liberty. Their expectations were disappointed, for the greatest part of the barbarians soon became Christians themselves; yet the followers of *Christ* had everywhere first to undergo great calamities.

§ 2. The friends of the old religion, in order to excite in the people the more hatred against the Christians, while the public calamities were daily increasing, renewed the obsolete complaint of their ancestors; that all things went well before *Christ* came, but since he had been everywhere embraced, the neglected and despised gods had let in evils of every kind upon the world. This weak attack was repulsed by *Augustine*, in his *Books on the city of God*; a copious work and full of erudition. He also prompted *Orosius* to write his *Books of History*, in order to show that the same and even greater calamities and plagues afflicted mankind before the Christian religion was published to the world. In Gaul the calamities of the times drove many to such madness, that they wholly excluded God from the government of the world, and denied his providence over human affairs. These were vigorously assailed by *Salvian*, in his *Books on the government of God*.

§ 3. But the persecutions of the Christians deserve to be more particularly noticed. In *Gaul* and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, who at first trampled upon all rights human and divine, are reported to have laid violent hands on innumerable Christians. In *Britain*, after the fall of the Roman power in that country, the inhabitants were miserably harassed by the neighbouring Picts and Scots who were barbarians. Having therefore suffered various calamities, they in the year 445 chose *Vortigern* for their king; and he finding his forces inadequate to repel the assaults of the enemy, in the year 449 called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid. But they landing with their troops in *Britain*, produced far greater evils to the inhabitants than they endured before; for these Saxons endeavoured to subdue the people whom they came to assist, and to bring the whole country into subjection to themselves. This

produced an obstinate and bloody war between the Britons and the Saxons, which continued with various fortune during 130 years, till the Britons were compelled to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and take refuge in Batavia and Cambria [the modern Holland and Wales]. During these conflicts, the condition of the British church was deplorable; for the Anglo-Saxons, who worshipped exclusively the gods of their ancestors, almost wholly prostrated it, and put a multitude of Christians to a cruel death.(1)

§ 4. In *Persia* the Christians suffered grievously, in consequence of the rash zeal of *Abdas* bishop of Suza, who demolished the *Pyraum*, a temple dedicated to *fire*. For being commanded by the king *Isdegerdes* to rebuild it, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death, in the year 414, and the churches of the Christians were levelled to the ground. Yet this conflict seems to have been of short duration. Afterwards *Vararanes* the son of *Isdegerdes*, attacked the Christians with greater cruelty, in the year 421, being urged to it partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his hatred of the Romans, with whom he was engaged in war. For as often as the Persians and the Romans waged war with each other, the Christians resident in Persia were exposed to the rage of their monarchs; because they were suspected, and perhaps not without reason, to be favourably disposed towards the Romans, and to betray their country to them.(2) A vast number of Christians perished under various exquisite tortures during this persecution.(3) But their tranquillity was restored when peace returned between *Vararanes* and the Romans, in the year 427.(4) The Jews likewise, who were opulent and in good credit in various parts of the East, harassed and oppressed the Christians in every way they could.(5) None of them was more troublesome and overbearing than *Gamaliel* their patriarch, who possessed vast power among the Jews; and whom therefore *Theodosius* junior restrained by a special edict, in the year 415.(6)

§ 5. So far as can be learned at this day, no one ventured to write books against Christianity and its adherents during the fifth century; unless perhaps, the Histories of *Olympiodorus*(7) and of *Zosimus*.(8) are to be con-

(1) See *Beda* and *Gildas*, among the ancients; and among the moderns, *Jā. Usher*, *Britannicarum Ecclesiar. Antiquitates*, cap. xii., p. 415, &c., and *Rapin Thoiras*, *History of England*, vol. i., b. ii., p. —, &c. [The Saxons were not directly persecutors of the Christians, but only involved them in the common calamities of their slaughtered and oppressed countrymen.—*Tr.*]

(2) *Theodoret*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. v., c. 39, [where is a full account of the conduct of *Abdas*, and of the sufferings of the Christians during the persecution.—*Tr.*] *Bayle*, *Dictionnaire historique*, article *Abdas*, vol. i., p. 10. *Barbeyrac*, *de la Morale des Peres*, p. 320. [An account of the manner in which Christianity obtained free toleration and an extensive spread in Persia, at the commencement of this century, through the influence of *Maruthas*, a bishop of Mesopotamia who was twice an ambassador to the court of Persia, is given by *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vii., c. 8.—*Tr.*]

(3) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i., p. 182, 248. [See also *Theodoret*, as above. The most distinguished sufferers in this persecution, were *Abdas* the bishop of Suza; *Hormisdas*, a Persian nobleman and son of a provincial governor; *Benjamin*, a deacon; *James*, who apostatized, but repented; and *Scenes*, who possessed 1000 slaves.—*Tr.*]

(4) *Soerates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vii., c. 20.

(5) *Soerates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vii., c. 13 and 16; and *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 265, &c.

(6) In the *Codex Theodos.*, tom. vi., p. 262, &c.

(7) *Photius*, *Biblioth.*, cod. lxxx., p. 178. [*Olympiodorus* was a native of Thebes in Egypt, a poet, historian, and an ambassador to the king of the Huns. He flourished about the year 425; and wrote *Historiarum Libri* xxii., addressed to *Theodosius* junior, and containing the Roman History, particularly of the West, from A.D. 407 to 425.

sidered of this character, the latter of whom is frequently sarcastic and unjustly severe upon the Christians. Yet no one can entertain a doubt that the philosophers and rhetoricians, who still kept up their schools in Greece, Syria, and Egypt, secretly endeavoured to corrupt the minds of the youth, and laboured to instil into them at least some of the principles of the proscribed superstition.(9) The history of those times, and the writings of several of the fathers, exhibit many traces of such clandestine machinations.

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of Learning among Christians.—§ 2. In the West.—§ 3. State of Philosophy in the West.—§ 4. In the East.—§ 5. The Younger Platonists.—§ 6. Aristotelian Philosophy revived.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the illiterate had access to every office both civil and ecclesiastical, yet most of the persons of much consideration were persuaded that the liberal arts and sciences were of great use to mankind. Hence public schools(1) were kept up in the larger cities, as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis,(2) Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and masters competent to teach youth were maintained at the expense of the emperors. Some of the bishops and monks also of this century, here and there imparted to young men what learning they possessed.(3) Yet the infelicity of the times, the incursions of barbarous nations, and the penury of great geniuses, prevented either the church or the state from reaping such advantages from the efforts to promote learning, as were desired by those engaged in them.

§ 2. In the western provinces, especially in Gaul, there were some men of learning, who might have served as patterns for others to follow. Such among others were *Macrobius*, *Salvian*, *Vincentius* of Lerins, *Ennodius*, *Si-*

The work is lost, except the copious extracts preserved by *Photius*, ubi supra.—*Tr.*]

(8) [*Zosimus* was a public officer in the reign of *Theodosius* junior, and wrote *Historiarum Libri* vi. in a neat Greek style. The first book gives a concise history of Roman affairs from Augustus to Diocletian; the following books are a full Roman history, down to A.D. 410. The best editions are by *Cellarius*, Jena, 1728, 8vo, and by *Reitemier*, Lips., 1784, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(9) *Zacharias Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 165, 200, ed. Barthii.

(1) [The history and progress of schools among Christians, are the subject of an appropriate work, by *George Gottl. Reufel*, Helmst., 1743, 8vo.—*Schl.*]

(2) [The schools at *Edessa* and *Nisibis*, are noticed by *Valesius*, on *Theodori Lectoris* Hist. Eccl., l. ii., p. 164, b.—*Schl.*]

(3) [On the episcopal and cloister schools, in Africa, Spain, Italy, and Gaul, remarks are made by *Ludov. Thomasinus*, de Disciplina Ecclesiae, tom. i., part ii., lib. ii., p. 27, &c.—*Schl.*]

donius Apollinaris, *Claudianus Mamertus*, and *Dracontius*; who as writers were not indeed equal to the ancient Latin authors, yet neither altogether destitute of elegance, and who devoted themselves to the study of antiquities and other branches of learning. But the barbarians who laid waste or took possession of the Roman provinces, choked these surviving plants of a better age. For all these nations considered arms and military courage as the only source of all glory and virtue; and therefore they despised learning and the arts. Hence wherever they planted themselves, there barbarism insensibly sprung up and flourished, and the pursuit of learning was abandoned exclusively to the priests and monks. And these, surrounded by bad examples and living in the midst of wars and perils, gradually lost all relish for solid learning and renown, and substituted in place of it a sickly spectre and an empty shadow of erudition. In their schools, the boys and youth were taught *the seven liberal arts*;(4) which being comprised in a few precepts, and those very dry and jejune, as appears from the treatises of *Augustine* upon them, were rather calculated to burden the memory than to strengthen the judgment and improve the intellectual powers. In the close of this century therefore, learning was almost extinct, and only a faint shadow of it remained.

§ 3. Those who thought it expedient to study philosophy—and there were but few who thought so—did not in this age commit themselves to the guidance of *Aristotle*. He was regarded as too austere a master, and one who carried men along a thorny path.(5) Perhaps more would have relished him, had they been able to read and understand him. But the system of *Plato* had for several ages been better known; and it was supposed, not only to be less difficult of comprehension, but to accord better with the principles of religion. Besides, the principal works of *Plato* were then extant in the Latin translations of *Victorinus*.(6) Therefore such among the Latins as had a taste for philosophical inquiries, contented themselves with the decisions of *Plato*; as will appear to any one who shall only read *Sidonius Apollinaris*.(7)

§ 4. The state of learning among the Greeks and the people of the East, both as respects elegant literature and the severer sciences, was a little better; so that among them may be found a larger number of writers, who exhibit some marks of genius and erudition. Those who prosecuted the science of jurisprudence, resorted much to *Berytus* in Phenicia, where was a celebrated law-school,(8) and to Alexandria.(9) The students of medicine and chymistry resorted also to Alexandria. The teachers of eloquence,

(4) [These comprised, I., the *Trivium*, namely, Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic; and II., the *Quadrivium*, or Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy. See below, century xi., part ii., ch. i., § 5.—*Tr.*]

(5) Passages from ancient writers in proof, are collected by *Joh. Launoï*, de varia Aristotelis fortuna in Academia Parisiensi.

(6) See *Augustine*, Confessionum lib. i., c. 2, § 1, Opp., tom. i., p. 105, 106.

(7) See his Epistles, lib. iv., Ep. iii., xi., and lib. ix., Ep. ix., and others.

(8) See *Ja. Hasaeus*, liber de Academia Jureconsultorum Berytensi; and *Zacharius Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 164.

(9) *Zacharius Mitylen.* de Opificio Dei, p. 179. [Among the moderns may be consulted *J. Andr. Schmidt's* Preface to *Andr. Hyperius* de Schola Alexandrina catechetica, Helmst., 1704, 8vo. *Hen. Dodwell*, ad fragmentum Philippi Sidetæ; at the end of his Dissertations on Irenæus. *Lud. Thomaſinus*, de Discipl. Eccles., tom. i., part i., l. ii., c. 10, p. 210, &c. *Joh. Geo. Michælis*, Exercit. de Scholæ Alexandrinæ sicut dictæ Catecheticae origine, progressu, et præcipuis doctores: in tom. i., Symbolar. litter. Bremens., p. 195, &c., and *Jos. Bingham*, Antiq. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 10, § 5.—*Schl.*]

poetry, philosophy, and the other arts, opened schools almost everywhere; and yet the teachers at Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were supposed to excel the others in learning and in the art of instructing.(10)

§ 5. The sect of the younger Platonists sustained itself and its philosophy, at Athens, at Alexandria, and in Syria, with no small share of its ancient dignity and reputation. *Olympiodorus*,(11) *Hero*,(12) and other men of high reputation, adorned the school of Alexandria. At Athens, *Plutarch*,(13) and his successor *Syrianus*,(14) with *Theophrastus*, procured for themselves fame and distinction. From them *Proclus* received instruction, became the prince of the Platonists of this century, and acquired for himself and for the species of wisdom which he professed so much celebrity among the Greeks, that he seems almost the second father of the system.(15) His disciples, *Marinus* of Neapolis, *Ammonius* the son of *Hermias*, *Isidorus*, *Damascius*, and others, followed eagerly in the footsteps of their instructor, and left many followers who copied their example. Yet the laws of the emperors, and the continual advances of Christianity, gradually diminished very much the fame and the influence of these philosophers.(16) And as there was a sufficient number now among the Christians, who cultivated and were able to teach this species of wisdom so much confided in at that day, it naturally followed that fewer persons than formerly frequented the schools of these heathen sages.

§ 6. But though the philosophy of *Plato* appeared to most persons more favourable to religion and better founded than that of *Aristotle*, yet the latter gradually emerged from its obscurity, and found its way into the hands of Christians. The Platonists themselves expounded some of the books of *Aristotle* in their schools, and particularly his *Dialectics*, which they recommended to such of their pupils as were fond of disputation. The Christians did the same, in the schools in which they taught philosophy. This was the first step made by the Stagyrte towards that universal empire which he afterwards obtained. Another and a more active cause was found in the Origenian, Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian contests, which produced so much evil in the church during this century. *Origen*, it was well known, was a Platonist. When therefore he fell under public censure, many, that they might not be accounted his adherents, applied themselves to the study of *Aristotle*, between whom and *Origen* there had been little or no connexion. In the Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies, both sides had recourse to the most subtile distinctions, di-

(10) *Æneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 16, &c., passim. *Zacharias Mitylen.* loc. cit., p. 164, 179, 217, &c., and others.

(11) [See note (7), supra, p. 319.—*Tr.*]

(12) *Marinus*, de *Vita Procli*, c. 9, p. 19, ed. Fabricii. [*Hero* was a preceptor of *Proclus*, and is the second of the three of his name mentioned by *Brucker* in his *Historia crit. Philos.*, tom. ii, p. 323.—*Schl.*]

(13) [This *Plutarch*, in distinction from the elder *Plutarch*, who was more of a historian than a philosopher, is denominated *Plutarchus Nestorii*, or *Plutarch the son of Nestorius*. See concerning him *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 312, &c.

Marinus, de *Vita Procli*, c. 12, p. 27, and *Suidas*, article *Plutarch Nestorii*, p. 133.—*Schl.*]

(14) [Concerning *Syrianus*, see *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 315.—*Schl.*]

(15) His life was written by *Marinus*, and was published with learned notes, by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Hamb., 1700, 4to. [See also *Brucker*, *Historia crit. Philos.*, tom. ii., p. 318, &c.—*Schl.*]

(16) See *Æneas Gazæus*, in his *Theophrastus*, p. 6, 7, 8, 13, ed. Barthii. [Among the moderns, *Brucker* (*Historia crit. Philosophiæ*, tom. ii., p. 337) has treated of all these disciples of *Proclus*.—*Schl.*]

visions, and ratiocinations; and with these they were supplied by the philosophy of *Aristotle*, and not at all by that of *Plato*, who never trained men to disputation. The Pelagian doctrines had great affinity with the opinions of *Plato* concerning God and the human soul. Many therefore ceased to be Platonists, as soon as they perceived this fact, and they suffered their names to be enrolled among the Peripatetics.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH, AND ITS TEACHERS.

§ 1, 2. The outward Form of Church Government somewhat Changed.—§ 3. The Prerogatives of Patriarchs.—§ 4. Evils arising from their Authority.—§ 5. Contests between them.—§ 6. The Power of the Roman Pontiff.—§ 7. Vices of the Clergy.—§ 8. Causes thereof. The Saints.—§ 9. Monks.—§ 10. Teachers in the Greek Church.—§ 11. In the Latin Church.

§ 1. FROM the operation of several causes, the outward form of government in the church experienced some change. The power of the bishops, particularly of the higher orders, was sometimes augmented and sometimes diminished, according as times and circumstances altered; yet the caprice of the court and political considerations had more influence in this matter, than any principles of ecclesiastical law. These changes, however, were of minor importance. Of much more consequence was the vast increase of honour and power acquired by the bishops of New Rome, or Constantinople, in opposition to the most strenuous efforts of the bishop of ancient Rome. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople [A.D. 381] had conferred on the bishop of New Rome the second rank among the highest bishops of the world, on account of the dignity and prerogatives of the city where he presided. The Constantinopolitan bishops (with the consent no doubt of the court) had likewise extended their jurisdiction over the provinces of [proconsular] Asia, Thrace, and Pontus. In this century, with the consent of the emperors, they not only acquired the additional province of eastern Illyricum, but likewise a great amplification of their honours and prerogatives. For in the year 451, the council of Chalcedon, by their twenty-eighth *canon*, decreed that the bishop of New Rome ought to enjoy the same honours and prerogatives with the pontiff of ancient Rome, on account of the equal dignity and rank of the two cities;(1) and by a formal act they confirmed his jurisdiction over the provinces which he claimed. *Leo* the Great, bishop of ancient Rome, and some other bishops, strenuously resisted this decree; but in vain, for the Greek emperors supported the cause of their bishops.(2) After the period of this

(1) [Yet it appears, from the words of the canon, that the bishop of Constantinople, though made equal in *power and authority* with the bishop of Rome, was to yield to him a precedence in *rank or honour*; because New Rome took rank after her older sister, *δευτέρα μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχειν*.—*Tr.*]

(2) *Mich. le Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i., p. 30, &c. [See also *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 310; and *Historie der Päpste*, p. 106.—*Schl.*; and *Arch. Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii., p. 64–84, ed. Lond., 1750, 4to.—*Tr.*]

council, the Constantinopolitan bishops began to contend fiercely for supremacy with the Roman bishops, and encroached on the privileges and dignity of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. In particular, *Acacius* of Constantinople is said to have exceeded all bounds in his ambitious projects.(3)

§ 2. It was nearly at the same time, that *Juvenal* bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of Aelia, attempted to withdraw himself and his church from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cæsarea, and affected to rank among the first prelates of the Christian world. His designs were rendered practicable by the high veneration entertained for the church of Jerusalem, as being not only founded and governed by apostles, but as a continuation of the primitive church of Jerusalem, and in a sense the mother of all other Christian churches. Therefore *Juvenal*, the emperor *Theodosius* junior favouring his designs, not only assumed the rank of an independent bishop over the three Palestines, or that of a *patriarch*, but likewise wrested Phenicia and Arabia from the patriarchate of Antioch. And as this produced a controversy between him and *Maximus* bishop of Antioch, the council of Chalcedon settled the dispute, by restoring Arabia and Phenicia to the see of Antioch, and leaving *Juvenal* in possession of the three Palestines.(4) with the title and rank which he had assumed.(5) In this manner there were five principal bishops over the Christian world, created in this century, and distinguished from others by the title of *patriarchs*.(6) The Oriental writers mention a sixth, namely, the bishop of *Seleucia and Ctesiphon*; to whom, they say, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction.(7) But they can bring no proof, except the Arabic decrees of the Nicene council, which are well known to have no authority.

§ 3. These *patriarchs* had great prerogatives. To them belonged the consecration of the bishops of their respective provinces. They annually convoked councils of their districts, to regulate and settle ecclesiastical affairs. If any great or difficult controversy arose, it was carried before the patriarch. The bishops, accused of any offences, were obliged to abide by his decision. And finally, to provide for the peace and good order of the remoter provinces of their patriarchates, they were allowed to place over them their own legates or *vicars*.(8) Other prerogatives of less moment are omitted. It was the fact, however, that some episcopal sees were not subject to the patriarchs; for both in the East and in the West, certain bishops were exempt from patriarchal jurisdiction, or were independent.(9)

(3) *Nouveau Dictionnaire hist. crit.*, tome i., article *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. [*Dr. Mosheim* here speaks cautiously; for in fact *Acacius*, when all circumstances are considered, was to be justified. See below, ch. v., § 21.—*Schl.*]

(4) Concerning the three Palestines, see *Carolus a S. Paulo*, *Geographia sacra*, p. 307, &c.

(5) *Mich. le Quien*, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii., p. 110, &c.

(6) See the writers who have treated of the patriarchs, as enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.*, cap. xiii., p. 453, &c. [See also note (2) p. 233, &c. of this volume.—*Tr.*]

(7) *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. i., p. 9, 13, &c.

(8) *David Blondell*, de la Primauté de l'Eglise, cap. xxv., p. 332, &c. *Theod. Ruinart*, de pallio Archi-Episcopali, p. 445; tom. ii. of the *Opp. posthuma of Joh. Mabilon*.

(9) *Edw. Brerewood*, de veteris ecclesie gubernatione patriarchale, a tract which is subjoined to *Ja. Usher's* *Opuscula de Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum origine*, Lond., 1687, and *Bremen*, 1701, 8vo, p. 56–85. [The metropolitans and bishops who were subject to no patriarch, were by the Greeks called *ἀντοκεφαλοι*. Of this description were the metropolitans of *Bulgaria*, *Cy-*

Moreover the emperors, who reserved to themselves the supreme power over the church, listened readily to the complaints of those who thought themselves injured; and the councils also, in which the majesty and the legislative power of the church resided, presented various obstacles to the arbitrary exercise of patriarchal power.

§ 4. The constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the Christian church, that it was rather the source of very great evils, and produced boundless dissensions and animosities. In the first place, the *patriarchs*, who had power either to do much good or to cause much evil, encroached without reserve upon the rights and privileges of their bishops, and thus introduced gradually a kind of spiritual bondage; and that they might do this with more freedom, they made no resistance to the encroachments of the bishops on the ancient rights of the people. For the more the prerogatives and the honours of the bishops who were under their control were increased, the more was their own power enlarged. In the next place, they designedly excited dissensions and fomented controversies of bishops with one another and with other ministers of religion, and also of the people with the clergy; so that they might have frequent occasions to exercise their authority, be much appealed to, and have a multitude of clients around them. Moreover, that the bishops might not be without intestine foes, nor themselves destitute of strenuous defenders of their authority, they drew over to their side the numerous tribes of monks, who were gradually acquiring wealth, and attached them to their interests by the most ample concessions. And these monks contributed much—perhaps more than any other cause—to subvert the ancient discipline of the church, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and to increase beyond all bounds the power of their patrons.

§ 5. To these evils must be added the rivalry and ambition of the *patriarchs* themselves; which gave birth to abominable crimes and the most destructive wars. The patriarch of Constantinople in particular, elated with the favour and the proximity of the imperial court, on the one hand subjected the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to a subordination to himself, as if they were prelates of a secondary rank, and on the other

prus, Iberia, Armenia, and also of *Britain* before the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons by the Romish monk *Augustine*. For the Britons had their archbishop of *Cuerleon*, (*Episcopus Caerlegionis super Osca*), who had seven bishops under him, but acknowledged no superintendence from the patriarch of Rome, and for a long time made opposition to him; and in *Wales* as well as in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, this independence continued for many centuries. The church of *Carthage* also was properly subject to no other church; as appears from *Leydecker's Historia Eccles. Africanæ*, and from the writings of *Capell* and others, *de appellationibus ex Africa ad sedem Romanam*. Some common bishops likewise, were subject to no metropolitan, but were under the immediate inspection of their patriarch. Thus the patriarch of Constantinople had 39 bishops in his diocese, who were subject immediate-

ly to him; and the Romish patriarch had in almost all his countries, (e. g., in Germany, at Bamberg and Fulda), bishops who were subject to no archbishop or primate, but dependant immediately on himself. There were also certain bishops, who were subject neither to any archbishop nor to a patriarch; as was the case with the bishop of *Tomis* in *Scythia*, according to *Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. vi., c. 21. The churches in countries lying without the Roman Empire, at first had no bishops dependant on the bishops within the empire; as e. g., the churches in *Persia*, *Parthia*, and among the *Goths*; and these did not come under the power of Romish patriarchs, until they fell under the civil power of the Romans. Most of the conversions of pagans by missionaries from Rome, were in the western provinces of the empire. See *Baumgarten's Erläuterung der christl. Alterthums*, p. 158, &c.—*Sehl.*]

hand he boldly attacked the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of some of his provinces. The two former, from their lack of power and from other causes, made indeed but feeble resistance, though they sometimes produced violent tumults and commotions; but the Roman pontiff, possessing much greater power and resources, fought with more obstinacy, and in his turn inflicted deadly wounds on the Byzantine prelate. Those who shall carefully examine the history of events among Christians from this period onward, will find that, from these quarrels about precedence and the boundaries of their power, among those who pretended to be the fathers and guardians of the church, chiefly originated those direful dissensions which first split the eastern church into various sects, and then severed it altogether from the church of the West.

§ 6. No one of these ambitious prelates was more successful than the Romish patriarch. Notwithstanding the opposition of the Constantinopolitan bishop, various causes enabled him to augment his power in no small degree; although he had not yet laid claim to the dignity of supreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Christian church. In the East, the Alexandrine and Antiochian patriarchs, finding themselves unequal to contend with the patriarch of Constantinople, often applied to the Roman pontiff for aid against him; (10) and the same measures were adopted by the ordinary bishops, whenever they found the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch invading their rights. To all these the pontiff so extended his protection, as thereby to advance the supremacy of the Roman see. In the West, the indolence and the diminished power of the emperors, left the bishop of the metropolis at full liberty to attempt whatever he pleased. And the conquests of the barbarians were so far from setting bounds to his domination, that they rather advanced it. For these kings, caring for nothing but the establishment of their thrones, when they saw that the people obeyed implicitly the bishops, and that these were dependant almost wholly on the Roman pontiff, deemed it good policy to secure his favour by bestowing on him privileges and honours. Among all those who governed the see of Rome in this century, no one strove more vigorously and successfully to advance its authority, than *Leo* who is commonly surnamed the *Great*. But neither he, nor the others, could overcome all obstacles to their ambition. This is evident, among other examples, from that of the Africans, whom no promises or threats could induce to allow their causes and controversies to be carried by appeal before the Roman tribunal. (11)

(10) [This is illustrated, among other examples, by the case of *John Talaiä*, patriarch of Alexandria, who being deposed, (A.D. 482), applied to the Roman bishop *Simplicius* for protection. See *Liberatus* Diaconus, *Breviarium*, c. 18—*Schl.*; and *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii., p. 189, &c., 194, ed. Lond., 1750.—*Tr.*]

(11) *Lud. Ell. du Pin*, de antiqua Eccles. Disciplina, Diss. ii., p. 166, &c. *Melch. Leydecker*, *Historia Eccles. Africanæ*, tom. ii., diss. ii., p. 505, &c. [A concise view of the steps by which the bishops of Rome mounted to the summit of their grandeur, is thus given by *J. Andr. Cramer*, in his German translation of *Bossuet's* Universal History,

vol. iv., p. 558, &c., as cited by *Von Einem*, in a note on this page of *Mosheim*. They were appointed by the emperors to decide causes in the western churches; they encouraged appeals to themselves; they assumed the care of all the churches, as if it were a part of their official duty; they appointed vicars in churches, over which they had no claims to jurisdiction; where they should have been only mediators, they assumed to be judges; they required accounts to be sent them of the affairs of foreign churches; they endeavoured to impose the rites and usages of their own church upon all others, as being of apostolic origin; they traced their own elevation from the pre-em-

§ 7. Of the vices of the whole clerical order, their luxury, their arrogance, their avarice, their voluptuous lives, we have as many witnesses, as we have writers of integrity and gravity in this age whose works have come down to us. The *bishops*, especially such as were distinguished for their rank and honours, employed various administrators to manage their affairs, and formed around themselves a kind of sacred court. The dignity of a *presbyter* was supposed to be so great, that *Martin* of Tours did not hesitate to say at a public entertainment, that the emperor himself was inferior to one of that order.(12) The *deacons* were taxed with their pride and their vices, in many decrees of the councils.(13) These stains on the character of the clergy, would have been deemed insufferable, had not most of the people been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and had not all estimated the rights and privileges of Christian ministers, by those of the ancient priests both among the Hebrews and among the Greeks and Romans. The fierce and warlike tribes of Germans, who vanquished the Romans and divided up the empire of the West among themselves, after they had embraced Christianity could bear with the dominion and the vices of the bishops and the clergy, because they had before been subject to the domination of priests; and they supposed the Christian priests and ministers of religion possessed the same rights with their former idolatrous priests.(14)

§ 8. This corruption among an order of men whose duty it was to inculcate holiness both by precept and example, will afford us less surprise,

inence of *St. Peter*; they maintained that their fancied prerogatives belonged to them by a *divine right*; they threatened with excommunication from the church, those who would not submit to their decrees; they set up and deposed metropolitans, in provinces over which they never legally had jurisdiction; and each successive pope was careful, at least not to lose anything of the illegal usurpations of his predecessors, if he did not add to them. The truth of this representation is abundantly confirmed with the evidence of historical facts, by various Protestant writers; and, among others, by *Arch. Bower*, in his *Lives of the Popes*, 7 vols. 4to, London, 1749, &c.—*Tr.*]

(12) *Sulpitius Severus*, de vita Martini, cap. xx., p. 339, and dial. ii., cap. vi., p. 457.

(13) See *Dav. Blondell*, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, p. 140.

(14) [That these pagan nations had been accustomed to treat their idolatrous priests with extraordinary reverence, is a fact well known. When they became Christians, they supposed they must show the same respect to the Christian priests. Of course they honoured their bishops and clergy, as they had before honoured their *Druids*; and this reverence disposed them to bear patiently with their vices. Every *Druid* was accounted a very great character, and was feared by every one; but the *Chief*

Druid was actually worshipped. When these people became Christians, they supposed that the *bishop of Rome* was such a *Chief Druid*; and that he must be honoured accordingly. And this was one cause, why the Roman pontiff obtained in process of time, such an ascendancy in the western countries. The patriarch of Constantinople rose indeed to a great elevation; but he never attained the high rank and authority of the Roman patriarch. The reason was, that the people of the East had not the same ideas of the dignity of a *Chief Priest* as the people of the West had. The eastern clergy also practised *excommunication* as a punishment of transgressors; but it never had such an influence in the East as it had in the West; and for this reason, that the effects of a pagan exclusion from religious privileges, never were so great in the East as in the West. The effects in the latter are described by *Julius Caesar*, de Bello Gallico, l. vi., c. 13, n. 6, &c. Si quis aut *privatus* aut *populus* eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Haec poena apud eos est *gravissima*. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur; ab iis omnes decedunt, adiuturum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant; neque iis potentibus jus redditur, neque honos *ullus* communicatur.—*Schl.*]

when we consider that a great multitude of persons were everywhere admitted, indiscriminately, and without examination, among the clergy; the greater part of whom had no other object than to live in idleness. And among these, very many were connected with no particular church or place, and had no regular employment, but roamed about at large, procuring a subsistence by imposing upon the credulity of others, and sometimes by dishonourable artifices. Whence then, some may ask, those numerous *saints* of this century, who are reported to us by both the eastern and the western writers? I answer, they were canonized by the ignorance of the age. Whoever possessed some excellence of talents and ingenuity, if they excelled considerably as writers or speakers, if they possessed dexterity in managing affairs of importance, or were distinguished for their self-government and the control of their passions; these persons, in an age of ignorance, appeared to those around them to be not men, but gods; or to speak more correctly, were considered as men divinely inspired and full of the Deity.

§ 9. The *monks*, who had formerly lived only for themselves, and who had not sought to rank among the clergy, gradually became a class distinct from the common laity, and acquired such opulence and such high privileges, that they could claim an honourable rank among the chief supports and pillars of the church. (15) The reputation of this class of persons for piety and sanctity was so great, that very often when a bishop or a presbyter was to be elected he was chosen from among them; (16) and the erection of edifices in which monks and nuns might conveniently serve God, was carried beyond all bounds. (17) They did not, however, all observe one and the same system of rules; but some followed the rules of *Augustine*, others those of *Basil*, and others those of *Antony*, or *Athanasius*, or *Pachomius*, &c. (18) Yet it must have been the fact that they

(15) *Epiphanius*, *Exposit. Fidei*, Opp., tom. i., p. 1094. *Joh. Mabillon*, *Reponse aux Chanoines reguliers*, Opp. posthum., tom. ii., p. 115.

(16) *Sulpitius Severus*, *de vita Martini*, c. x., p. 320. Add, *Dial. i.*, c. xxi., p. 426.

(17) *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial. i.*, p. 419. *Henr. Noris*, *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. ii., c. 3, in Opp., tom. i., p. 273. *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 35.

(18) [A *monk* was one who professed wholly to renounce this world, with all its cares and pleasures, and to make religion his sole business. The particular manner in which he proposed to employ himself, was called his *rule*. The early monks, of the third century, were called *Eremites* or hermits; that is, they retired from all human society, and lived in solitude in the deserts and mountains. Such in particular were the Egyptian monks. In the fourth century they became so numerous in Egypt, as to turn their favourite desert into a populous country; and *St. Antony*, a leading man among them, induced great numbers to adopt his particular rule. *St. Pachomius* about the same time organized the monks of

Tabennesis into a kind of *society*; and henceforth most monks became *associated hermits*, having separate cells, but living under chiefs called *abbots*. *Basil* the Great improved on the plan of *Pachomius*, by erecting houses in different parts of the country, in which monks might live together in a kind of family state. He also made his monasteries *schools* for the cultivation of sacred learning. *St. Athanasius*, according to some, (see note 26, p. 265, above), while resident in Italy, taught the people of that country how to form and regulate these associations of monks. And *St. Augustine* first established a kind of monastery in his native town in Africa; and afterwards, when bishop of Hippo, he and some of his clergy formed an association for religious purposes, which gave rise to the *regular Canons*, a species of clergy whose private life was that of monks. During the fifth century, the passion for monastic life was very great, and monks and nuns became extremely numerous in the West as well as the East. Yet, hitherto there had not been required of monks any vows of *perpetual* celibacy, poverty, and obedience, nor of adherence for ever to any one

were all very remiss and negligent in the observance of their rules, since the licentiousness of monks had even in this century become proverbial; (19) and these armies of lazy men, we are told, excited in various places dreadful seditions. From the enactments of the councils of this century, it clearly appears, that all monks of every sort were under the protection of the bishops in whose dioceses they lived; nor did the *patriarchs*, as yet, arrogate to themselves any jurisdiction over them. (20)

§ 10. Among the Greek and Oriental writers of this century, the most distinguished was *Cyril*, bishop of Alexandria, very famous for his different controversies and writings. No impartial person will divest him of all praise; yet no good man will excuse his quarrelsome temper, his restless spirit, and his very great transgressions. (21) Next to him must be

rule of life; but every one was free to continue a monk or not, and to pass from one society or class of monks to another, at his option. Different monasteries had different rules, according to the will of their founders or governors; but in all, the written rules, if they had any, were few and simple, the abbots possessing despotic power over their little kingdoms. The diversity which then prevailed among the monasteries as to their rules, is thus described by father *Mabillon*, (*Annales Benedictini*, lib. i., § 13, tom. i., p. 6, &c.), "As well in the East as in the West, there were almost as many different forms and rules, as there were different cells and monasteries," says *Cassianus*, *Institut.*, l. ii., c. 1. In some, the pleasure of the abbot was the only rule; in others, the mode of life was regulated by custom and former usage; in most however, there were written rules. And, because all monastic rules, whether written or not, aimed at one and the same object, viz., to withdraw men from all worldly concerns, and from all worldly thoughts, so that they might be wholly devoted to God and religion; the monasteries were not in general so confined to any one rule but that they could adopt or superinduce another, at the discretion of the abbot; and this, without changing their profession, and without harm. Hence in the same monastery, diverse written rules were observed at the same time, with such modifications as were necessary to adapt them to particular times and places. And yet, amid this great diversity of rules, there was the greatest harmony among all the monks, who constituted in reality but one society and one body, and were distinguished from each other by no peculiarities of dress. Removal also from one monastery to another, and mutual abode with each other, were easy and free; and not only where both monasteries were of Latins, but also where one was of Latins and the other of Greeks."—*Tr.*]

(19) *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial.* i., cap. viii., p. 399, &c.

VOL. I.—T T

(20) See *Joh. Launoï*, *Inquisitio in chartam immunitatis B. Germani*, in his *Opp.*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 3, &c., 38, &c. In the ancient records posterior to this century, the monks are often called (*clerici*) clergymen. See *Joh. Mabillon*, *Praefatio ad Saecul.* ii. Actor. Sanctior. Ord. Benedicti, p. xiv. And this is evidence, that they then began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or ministers of the church.

(21) The works of *Cyril* were published by *Joh. Aubertus*, at Paris. 1638, 6. vols., [in vii. parts], folio.—[*St. Cyrillus* was nephew to *Theophilus*, and his successor in the chair of Alexandria from A.D. 412 to 444. Soon after his election, he persecuted the Novatians; assumed the direction of political affairs; quarrelled with *Orestes*, the governor of Egypt; and is said to have occasioned several insurrections and much bloodshed at Alexandria; to have instigated the murder of *Hypatia*, an eminent female philosopher; and to have pulled down the Jews' synagogue, plundered it, and chased the Jews from the city. See *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. viii., c. 7, 13, 14, 15, and *Damasius*, in *Suidas*, *Lex. voce ὑπατία*. From the year 429, he was the most zealous and efficient opposer of *Nestorius* and his doctrines; wrote against him; condemned his doctrines in a synod at Alexandria, in his noted xii. chapters; presided in the council of Ephesus, where *Nestorius* was condemned and deposed A.D. 431. His zeal against *Nestorius* drew on himself deposition, by some Oriental bishops; but he was soon restored. With the bishop of Rome, he was always on the most friendly terms. He was certainly a man of talents, and his voluminous writings display much acuteness and learning, though the style is unpolished and not very clear. More than half of them are expositions of the scriptures; viz., of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and the Gospel of John. The others are polemic treatises, against Arians, Nestorians, and others, who erred in respect to the Trin-

placed *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrus, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, whose merits in every branch of theological learning are by no means contemptible, notwithstanding he is said to have imbibed some part of the Nestorian doctrine.(22) *Isidorus Pelusiota* has left us [numerous, short] Epistles, which display more piety, ingenuity, erudition, and judgment, than the large volumes of some others.(23) *Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria,

ity and the person of *Christ*; 10 Books against *Julian*; about 50 Sermons; and near 60 Letters. See his life, in *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xviii., p. 313-354.—*Tr.*]

(22) For a fine edition of the whole works of *Theodoret*, we are indebted to the Jesuit *Jac. Sirmond*, who edited them at Paris, 1642, in 4 vols., folio. The Jesuit *Jo. Garnier*, afterwards added a fifth volume, Paris, 1685, folio. [*Theodoret* or *Theodorit*, was born at Antioch about the year 386, of wealth and pious parents. He was their only child, and like *Samuel*, the son of their vows; and therefore named *Theodoretus*, given of God. When not quite seven years old, he was placed in a neighbouring monastery for education, where he had for associates *Nestorius* and *John*, who became the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch; and for instructors, *Theodorus* bishop of Mopsuestia, and *Chrysostom*, from whom he learned eloquence and sacred literature. He became early pious, was first made lector, and then deacon, in the church of Antioch; and in the year 420, was ordained bishop of *Cyrus*, a considerable city in Syria, near the Euphrates, where he is said to have had the charge of 800 churches. The country was overrun with antitrinitarian sectarians and with Marcionites, of whom he nearly purged his diocese, having, as he says, baptized no less than 10,000 Marcionites. In the year 429, his early friend *Nestorius* broached his errors respecting the person of *Christ*, and was condemned by *Cyril* of Alexandria. *Theodoret* espoused the cause of his friend; which involved him in a quarrel with *Cyril* as long as they lived. He was one of those, who in the year 431 deposed *Cyril* at Ephesus; for which he was sent home in disgrace by the emperor *Theodosius* junior. *Cyril* died in 444; and *Theodoret* expressed his joy at the event, which so enraged the emperor, that he confined him to his house. In 449, he was deposed in the second synod of Ephesus, and applied to the bishop of Rome, who now espoused his cause. *Theodosius* died in 450, and his successor restored *Theodoret* to his see; and afterwards summoned him to be a member of the council of Chalcedon in 451, where he professed his orthodoxy, and was reluctantly brought to condemn *Nestorius*. After this, return-

ing to his diocese, he devolved most of his episcopal duties on *Hypatius*, and devoted himself to writing books, till the year 457, when he died, aged about 71. He was frank, open-hearted, ingenuous, had elevated views and feelings, was resolute and unbending, yet generous, sympathetic, and ardently pious. His learning was great, his genius good, and his productions among the best of that age. The first and second volumes of his works embrace his Commentaries on the greater part of the Old Testament. Volume third contains Comments on all the Epistles of Paul; Hist. Ecclesiastica, in five books; (a continuation of *Eusebius*, from A.D. 320 to A.D. 427, written in a style elevated, clear, and well adapted to history); Philotheus, or Historia Religiosa; (eulogies of 30 distinguished monks); and 146 epistles. Volume fourth contains four books or dialogues, entitled Eranistes, or Polymorphus; (polemic, on the person of Christ); Hæreticarum Fabular. lib. v (an account of the ancient Heresies); de Providentia Orationes x. adversus Gentes, or Graccarum affectionum curatio, (an apology for Christianity), in 12 books; and some other small pieces. The fifth volume contains some other expository pieces, several sermons, 34 epistles, and seven dialogues against the Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarists.—All his works, Gr. and Lat., with Notes, were republished by *J. L. Schulze*, Halle, 1768-74, in five volumes, in nine, 8vo. See his life, in *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xviii., p. 355-432.—*Tr.*]

(23) The best edition of these letters, is that of the Jesuit, *Andr. Schott*, Paris, 1638, fol.—[*Isidorus* was probably a native of Alexandria, but he spent his life in a monastery near *Pelusium*, now Damietta, on one of the mouths of the Nile; and hence his surname of *Pelusiota*. He flourished about A.D. 412; but was active and conspicuous from the year 388 to 431. As a monk he was very austere in his mode of living; and retiring from the noise and bustle of the world, he devoted himself to reading and expounding the Scriptures, and to the practice and the promotion of piety and virtue. He chose the epistolary form of writing; and has left us 2013 short letters, which are divided into five books. In most of them a question is proposed, and answered by the exposition of a text of Scripture. The object

has left us very little in writing; but he has perpetuated his name, by his opposition to *Origen* and his followers.(24) *Palladius*, on account of his *Lausiac History*, and his *Life of Chrysostom*, deserves a place among the respectable and useful writers.(25) Notwithstanding *Theodorus* of Mop-suestia was accused after his death of the grossest errors, yet every one who has examined the extracts from his writings by *Photius*, will regret that his works are either entirely lost, or exist only in Syriac among the Nestorians.(26) *Nilus* composed many works calculated to excite reli-

is to expound the Scriptures, and to inculcate the doctrines and duties of religion. He was an admirer of *Chrysostom*; and of course had difficulty with *Theophilus* and *Cyril*, the patriarchs of Alexandria. But he feared no man, whenever he thought duty called him to defend truth or to censure vice.—*Tr.*]

(24) See *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.*, p. 103. [*Theophilus*, bishop of Alexandria from the year 385 to the year 412, was a man of a strong, active, courageous mind; but crafty, unscrupulous, selfish, and ambitious. He probably spent some of his early years among the monks of Nitria. Afterwards he became a presbyter of Alexandria, wrote a Paschal Cycle in 380, and was made bishop in 385. In the year 388, when *Theodosius* senior waged war in Italy upon *Maximus* the usurper, *Theophilus* sent his legate *Isidorus* to Rome, with letters and presents to both emperors; but with instructions to await the issue of the battle, and then to present only the letter and presents directed to the victor. (*Sozomen*, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. viii., c. 2.) In the year 391, he solicited and obtained of the emperor leave to persecute the pagans of Alexandria, and proceeded to demolish their temples and seize whatever was valuable in them. Insurrections and bloodshed, and the flight of the philosophers from Egypt, were the consequence. (*Socrates*, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. v., c. 16.) The major part of the ignorant monks of Nitria had such gross ideas of the Supreme Being, as to suppose he literally had *eyes* and *feet* and *hands*, and were therefore called *Anthropomorphites*. But the better informed monks held, that these expressions were to be taken metaphorically, as *Origen* had always interpreted them. And thus this controversy resolved itself into a contest respecting *Origen's* correctness as a theologian. At first, *Theophilus* favoured the Origenists; but the *Anthropomorphites* came upon him tumultuously, about the year 399, and compelled him to change sides. From this time, he was a zealous persecutor of all Origenists, (notwithstanding he continued to read and admire his works), and he actually made a bloody crusade against those Nitric monks

who opposed the *Anthropomorphites*, drove them from Egypt, and followed them with persecution, and also all who befriended them, and in particular *Chrysostom*, whom he deposed in the year 403. See *Socrates*, *H. E.*, vi., 7-17. *Sozomen*, viii., 11-19.—His works are not numerous, and have never been collected and published by themselves. They consist of three Paschal Letters, or Episcopal Charges; several Letters; and considerable extracts from different polemic treatises.—*Tr.*]

(25) [*Palladius* was born in Galatia, in the year 368. In his 20th year, he went to Egypt, and spent several years among different tribes of monks. The failure of his health obliged him to return from the wilderness to Alexandria, and thence to Palestine. In the year 400, *Chrysostom* made him bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia; which he exchanged some years after, for Aspona in Galatia. The time of his death is unknown; but it is supposed to have been before A.D. 431. *Palladius* was a man of moderate talents and erudition, but pious, a devoted monk, and a perspicuous, unassuming writer. His works are, (I.) *Historia Lausiacæ*, seu *de SS. Patrum vitis, ad Lausum cubiculi Præfectum*; (Biography of 30 of the most famous monks); written about the year 421; edited, Gr. and Lat., by *Fronto le Duc*, in his *Auctarium Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ii., p. 893-1053, Paris, 1624, fol. Some editions were afterwards published by *Cotelier*, *Monument. Eccl. Gr.*, tom. iii. Several Latin translations are extant, often published.—(II.) *Dialogus de Vita S. Joh. Chrysostomi, inter Palladium Episc. Hellenopolitanum et Theodorum*, (Life or Eulogy of *John Chrysostom*), first published, Gr. and Lat., by *Emer. Bigot*, Paris, 1680, and again 1738, 4to; with some other works. Whether the *Palladius* who wrote this, was the same as the author of the *Lausiac History*, has been questioned.—(III.) *De gentibus India, et Brachmannis Liber*, is extant under his name; but it is not supposed to be genuine.—*Tr.*]

(26) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 227, [and *ibid.*, pt. i., p. 3-362, where we have *Ebed Jesu's* catalogue of his works.

gious emotions, but more commendable for the pious intentions of the writer, than for his accurate and laboured thoughts. (27) Our designed brevity obliges us to pass over what might be worthy of notice in *Basil* of Seleucia, (28) *Theodotus* of Ancyra, (29) *Gelasius* of Cyzicum, (30) and others. (31)

—*Theodorus* was born and educated at Antioch, where he was some time a presbyter, and where he and *Chrysostom* instructed youth in a monastery, and had for pupils *Theodoret*, the famous *Nestorius* patriarch of Constantinople, and *John* patriarch of Antioch. In the year 392, he was made bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, where he spent 36 years, with great reputation as a preacher, a bishop, and especially as an author. After his death, which happened in the year 428, he was accused of *Nestorian* and likewise of *Pelagian* sentiments; and was condemned as a heretic, in the fifth general council, at Constantinople A.D. 553. His writings were very numerous, embracing literal expositions of nearly the whole Bible, elaborate polemic works, against the Arians, Eunomians, Apollinarians, &c., with many sermons and epistles, and a liturgy. A Latin translation of the last, is in *Renaudot*, Liturgiar. Oriental. Collectio, tom. ii., p. 616–625. His *Expositio Fidei* entire, and copious extracts from many of his other works, are extant in the Acts of the fifth general council, apud *Harduin*, tom. iiii., in the works of *Marius Mercator*, and of other fathers, and in the *Catenae Patrum*, especially the *Catena* in *Octateuchum*, Lips., 1772, 2 vols. fol., and in *Münter's* *Fragmenta Patr. Gr.*, fascic. i., p. 79, &c., Copenhag., 1788, 8vo. See *Schroeckh*, Kirchengesch., vol. xv., p. 176–218, and *Lardner*, *Credibility*, &c., vol. ix., p. 389, &c.—*Tr.*]

(27) [*Nilus* was born of a noble family, at Constantinople, where he became prefect of the city. Under the preaching of *Chrysostom*, he became pious, renounced the world, separated from his wife, and, taking one of his two sons with him, retired among the monks of Egypt, where he spent the remainder of his days. By robbers he lost all his property, and had his son captured; but he recovered his son. He was made a presbyter, and probably lived till near the middle of this century. His numerous writings have been read with pleasure by the lovers of monastic piety. His 355 epistles were published, Gr. and Lat., by *Leo Allatius*, Rome, 1668, fol.; and his *Opuscula*, (21 treatises on moral and ascetic subjects), Gr. and Lat., by *Jos. Maria Suarez*, Rome, 1673, folio.—*Tr.*]

(28) [*Basil* was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria before the year 448, and continued so till after the year 458. He possessed

some talents; but he was an unstable man. In the council of Constantinople A.D. 448, he voted with the orthodox, and condemned *Eutyches*. The next year, in the council of Ephesus, he openly sided with the Eutychians, and anathematized the orthodox. And two years after, in the council of Chalcedon, he appeared again on the orthodox side, and said he had been compelled to act with the Eutychians; but he had much difficulty to persuade the orthodox of his sincerity, and to allow him his episcopal office.—His works were published, Gr. and Lat., subjoined to those of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* and *Macarius* the monk, Paris, 1622, fol. They consist of 43 orations; of which 17 are on the Old Testament, and 26 on the New; written in a lofty style, and tolerably perspicuous, but excessively flowery. The *Demonstration* that Christ has come, against the Jews, founded on the 70 weeks of *Daniel*, and the two books on the *Life of St. Thccla*, the virgin and martyr, though printed among his works, are supposed by many to be not genuine.—*Tr.*]

(29) [*Theodotus*, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, flourished about the year 430. Little is known of him, except that he acted a conspicuous part in the council of Ephesus, which condemned *Nestorius* in the year 431. Three Orations, which he then delivered at Ephesus, (two on Christmas day, and one against *Nestorius*), are extant, Gr. and Lat., among the Acts of that council, tom. iii., p. 988, 1008, 1024. Another of his orations was published with the works of *Amphilochius*, Paris, 1644. His *Exposition of the Nicene creed*, or *Confutation of Nestorius*, was published, Gr. and Lat., by *Combesis*, Paris, 1675, 12mo. *Theodotus*, in the close of the last-mentioned work, refers to his three Books on the Holy Spirit, which are lost; as are his seven Books against *Nestorius*, addressed to *Lausus*. He has been accounted a good polemic writer.—*Tr.*]

(30) [*Gelasius* Cyzicenus was a native of *Cyzicus*, an island in the Propontis, where his father was a presbyter. He flourished about A.D. 476, and was bishop of *Cæsarea* in Palestine. He is known chiefly by his *History of the Nicene Council*, or as the Gr. MSS. style it, his *Ecclesiastical History*, in iii. Books. The first Book contains the affairs of *Constantine*, till the death of *Licinius* in 324. The second contains subsequent events, the calling of the council, and

the transactions in it and during it, especially the disputes of the philosophers and Arians with the Nicene fathers. The *third* Book, which is now lost, contained the subsequent life and deeds of *Constantine*. As for the sources from which he drew his information, he tells us, that when a boy at Cyzicus he met with an old MS. history of the Nicene council, written by one *Dalmatius* a former bishop of Cyzicus; that he then made large extracts from it; and many years after, composed his history from these extracts, and from the writings of *Eusebius*, *Rufinus*, &c. This work of *Gelasius*, once in high repute, is now little esteemed; in particular, the account of the disputes of the philosophers and Arians, which constitute the greater part of the second book, are considered very questionable. The two surviving books were published, Gr. and Lat., by *R. Bulf. Scot.* Paris, 1599, 8vo; and in the Collections of Councils, by *Harduin*, tom. i., p. —.—[Tr.]

(31) [The Greek and Oriental writers, passed by in silence by *Dr. Mosheim*, are very numerous. As some knowledge of them is useful, and indeed necessary for a theologian, a tolerably complete catalogue of them, extracted from *Cave's* *Historia Litteraria*, is here subjoined.

Asterius, bishop of Amasea in Pontus; flourished about A.D. 401; an eloquent and popular preacher. More than twenty of his Homilies are published, by *Combefis* and *Cotelier*.

Marcus, a monk of Nitria, Egypt; flourished A.D. 401. Seven tracts on practical piety, written with great simplicity, are extant in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr., tom. i.

Victor of Antioch, a contemporary of *Chrysostom*; wrote a Commentary on Mark's Gospel; extant, Lat., in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. iv., p. 370.

Severianus, bishop of Gabala in Syria; flourished A.D. 401; a turgid writer, but a popular preacher. Twelve of his orations are extant, among the works of *Chrysostom*.

Heracledes, a monk of Constantinople; flourished A.D. 402. He wrote *Paradisus*, or *Lives of the monks*; much of which is copied into the *Lausiac History* of *Pulladius*, and the remainder was published by *Cotelier*, Monument. Eccl. Gr., tom. iii.

Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 406–427; an enemy of *Chrysostom*, but famed for learning, address, and piety. Two of his letters, and some fragments, are extant.

Polychronus, bishop of Apamea; flourished A.D. 410–427; was brother to *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. His exposition of the Canticles, and fragments of his Commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel, are extant.

Nonnus, a converted pagan poet, of Egypt; flourished A.D. 410. His *Dionysiaca*, in 48 Books, written before his conversion, have been often published; e. g., Hanover, 1605, 8vo. His poetic version of John's Gospel, was published, Gr. and Lat., by *Heinsius*, 1627, 8vo, and his *Collectio et Explicatio Historiarum*, by *R. Montague*, Eton, 1610, 4to. He was a scholar, but a turgid writer.

Synesius, a philosopher, statesman, poet, and after A.D. 410, bishop of Ptolemais, in Cyrene, Africa; a man of fine talents, and a devoted bishop; but more of a philosopher than theologian. Besides several treatises, philosophical, political, and historical, he has left us 155 Epistles, 10 Hymns, and some sermons; all published, Gr. and Lat., by *Petavius*, Paris, 1612 and 1633, fol.

Philip of Side in Pamphylia, a friend of *Chrysostom*, and candidate for the see of Constantinople in 427. He wrote a religious History, from the creation to his own times, in 36 Books; a prolix and tedious work, of which only extracts remain.

Eudocia, a learned Athenian lady, born A.D. 401, converted to Christianity at 20, and soon after married to the emperor *Theodosius* II.; proclaimed empress in 432; divorced, for a slight cause, in 445; then retired to Jerusalem, and spent her life in works of charity and beneficence; and in composing *Centones Homerici*, poetic paraphrases of the Bible, and other religious poems. She died A.D. 459, aged 58.

Philostorgius, born in Cappadocia A.D. 368, well educated at Constantinople, a *Eunomian* or *Semiarian* in principle. He composed, about the year 425, an Ecclesiastical History in xii. Books, extending from the first rise of Arianism, to A.D. 425. The work itself is lost; but an epitome of it by *Photius*, was edited by *Valesius*, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians. His work was partial to the Arians, and is therefore censured by *Photius* and others.

Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace; flourished A.D. 425. He was of the sect of *Macedonius*; and published a Collection of the acts of the councils, from A.D. 325 to 425. The work is lost, except some extracts, preserved by *Socrates* and others.

John, bishop of Antioch, A.D. 427–441. He at first supported his early friend *Nestorius*; but afterwards abandoned him and his sect. Six of his Epistles are extant, Gr. and Lat., in Collect. Concilior., tom. iii.; and fifteen more, Latin, in *Lupus'* Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Nestorius, presbyter at Antioch, and bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 428–431. As a bishop, he was very zealous to suppress all

the prevailing heresies ; but he soon incurred the charge of heresy himself, by maintaining that in the person of *Christ*, the two natures were not so united as to form but *one person* ; and that it was improper to call *Mary Θεοτόκος*, the mother of God ; though she might be called *Χριστοτόκος*, the mother of *Christ*. For this opinion, he was condemned and deposed, in a council at Ephesus, A.D. 431. Afterwards, the emperor confined him to a monastery near Antioch ; and then banished him to the deserts of Egypt, where he wandered several years, suffered much, and at last died. He was a popular preacher, and an active bishop, but, according to *Socrates*, (H. E., viii., 32), not a very profound man. Besides numerous extracts from various of his works, several entire Epistles and some Sermons are extant, in the Collections of councils, in *Lupus'* Ephesine Epistles, and in the works of *Chrysostom*, *Mercator*, &c.

Meletius, bishop of Mopsuestia, A.D. 428 and onward ; a staunch Nestorian, deposed and banished for this heresy. *Eleven* of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Isaac, a converted Jew, flourished A.D. 430, author of a treatise on the *Trinity*, and the incarnation of *Christ*, in bad Greek ; extant among the *Opuscula Veterum dogmatica* ; published by *Sirmond*, Paris, 1630, 8vo.

Acacius, a monk, and bishop of Beraea, from about 378 to 436. He was a man in high repute, and has left us *three* epistles.

Acacrus, bishop of Melitene in Armenia ; a staunch opposer of *Nestorius* in the council of Ephesus A.D. 431. A homily he delivered there, and an Epistle, are extant ; in the Concil., tom. iii., and in *Lupus'* Collection of Ephesine Epistles.

Dorotheus, bishop of Martianopolis in Moesia ; a bold defender of *Nestorius* at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed, and at last banished. *Four* of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis in Syria ; a defender of *Nestorius* at Ephesus A.D. 431, and therefore deposed and banished. He has *23* Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Maximinus, bishop of Anazarbum in Cilicia ; a defender of *Nestorius* at Ephesus A.D. 431 ; but afterwards renounced him. He has *three* Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Helladius, for sixty years abbot of a monastery near Antioch, and then bishop of Tarsus. While a bishop, he defended *Nestorius* in the council of Ephesus, and for some time after ; but at length renounced him. *Six* of his Epistles are in the Ephesine Collection.

Euthernus, archbishop of Tyanea ; defended *Nestorius* in the council of Ephesus, though not a Nestorian in sentiment. He was deposed and banished. *Five* of his Epistles are extant in the Ephesine Collection ; and *seventeen* of his Sermons, against various heresies, Gr. and Lat., among the works of *Athanasius*.

Paul, bishop of Emesa ; a defender of *Nestorius* in the Ephesine council ; but he afterwards retracted. He has left us a confession of his faith, *two* Homilies, and an Epistle.

Andreas, bishop of Samosata ; a defender of *Nestorius* from the year 429 to 436, when he renounced him. He has *eight* Epistles in the Ephesine Collection.

Proclus, amanuensis to *Chrysostom*, and to *Atticus* ; and the bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 432–446. He was a very pious man, a good scholar, and a popular preacher. His works, consisting of twenty Sermons, and six Epistles, were published, Gr. and Lat., by *Ricardi*, Rome, 1630, 4to.

Ibas, from about A.D. 436, bishop of Edessa. He was accused of Nestorianism, and acquitted in 448 ; but was accused again and condemned in 449 ; and restored in 451. The greater part of a valuable letter of his, containing a history of the Nestorian contests, is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the Concilior., tom. iv., p. 661.

Socrates, Scholasticus, a barrister at Constantinople ; flourished A.D. 440. He composed a faithful Ecclesiastical History, from the accession of *Constantine* the Great, to A.D. 439, in vii. Books ; which is edited by *Valesius*, among the Greek Eccl. Historians.

Hermias Sozomenus, also a Constantinopolitan barrister, and an author of an Ecclesiastical History, from A.D. 324 to A.D. 439, in ix. Books. He is a more vivacious writer than *Socrates*, but is deemed less judicious. Yet writing after *Socrates*, he has supplied some of his deficiencies. The work was edited by *Valesius*, among the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians.

Irenaeus, Count of the empire, and the emperor's commissioner at the council of Ephesus in 431. He favoured the Nestorians in that council ; and defended their cause all his life ; and therefore, was excluded the court in 435, became bishop of Tyre in 444, was deposed by the emperor in 448 ; and then commenced writing a copious *Memoir* of the Ephesine council, and of ecclesiastical affairs in the East for about twenty years. The work is lost, except the old Latin translation of certain parts of it, which was published by *Christian Lupus*, Louvain, 1682, 4to, under the title of *Variarum Patrum Epistolarum ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*.

§ 11. Among the Latin writers, the first place is due to the Roman pontiff *Leo I.*, surnamed the *Great*; a man of eloquence and genius, but immoderately devoted to the extension of the limits of his power. (32)

Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 447-449. He has left us *two* Epistles, and a Creed; extant in *Baluze*, Nov. Collect. Concilior.

Eutyches, the heretic, a presbyter of Constantinople. He so opposed Nestorianism, as to confound the *two natures*, as well as the *two persons of Christ*. This error he broached in the year 448. He was condemned the same year; appealed to a general council, and was again condemned in 451. A Confession of his faith, with a few of his Letters, is extant.

Eusebius, first a civilian at Constantinople, and then bishop of Dorylaeum in Phrygia. He was the public accuser of *Nestorius*, of *Eutyches*, and of *Dioseorus*; from the year 430 to 451. His *Libels*, and some other of his documents, are extant.

Diadochus, bishop of Photice in Epirus; flourished A.D. 450. He has left us some treatises on practical religion; ed. Gr., at Florence, 1578; and Lat., in *Bilioth. Patrum*, tom. v.

Euthalius, a deacon in Egypt; flourished perhaps A.D. 458. He wrote an analytical Introduction to the books of the New Testament, published, Gr. and Lat., by *Zacagnius*, Rome, 1698, 4to.

Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 471-488; very ambitious and active for the aggrandizement of his see. He has left us only *two* Epistles.

Nestorianus, a Greek chronographer, who flourished about the year 474. He wrote *Lives of the Roman emperors*, to A.D. 474. The work was highly commended by *John Malala*; but it is lost.

Johannes Egeates, a Nestorian; flourished A.D. 483, or later; and wrote an Ecclesiastical History, in 10 Books; of which, (says *Photius*), the *five* first Books reached from A.D. 428 to 479. Only some extracts of it remain.

Sabas, a Syrian monk and abbot, born in 439, died 531. He wrote a *Typicum*, or the order of prayer for the whole year; which was adopted in all the monasteries about Jerusalem, and is still extant.

Justin, a bishop in Sicily, A.D. 484; author of some epistles, and, (as *Dodwell* supposes), of the *Questions ad Orthodoxos*, published among the works of *Justin Martyr*.

Æneas Gazæus, a sophist and a Platonist, and then a Christian; flourished about A.D. 488. He was the author of a noted dialogue entitled *Theophrastus*, or on the

immortality of souls and the resurrection of the body; ed., Gr. and Lat., by *Barth*, Lips., 1658, 4to.

Athanasius junior, or *Celestes*, bishop of Alexandria A.D. 490-497; a fine biblical scholar, an active and good bishop, and a devout man. He is supposed to be the author of several of the works ascribed to *Athanasius the Great*, and published as such: namely, (1) *Sacrae Scripturae Synopsis*; (2) *Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Antiochum*; (3) the *two* tracts, de *Incarnatione Verbi Dei*; (4) *Syntagma doctrinae, ad Clericos et Laicos*; (5) de *Virginitate, sive Asceti*.

Zacharius, a rhetorician, flourished A.D. 491. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History, from A.D. 450-491, which is often quoted as well as censured for partiality, by *Evaagrius*, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

Eustathius, of Syria, flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Chronicorum Compendium*, from *Æneas* to *Anastasius*, or A.D. 496, in ix. books, which are lost.

Malchus, a Byzantine sophist, flourished A.D. 496. He composed a Roman History, from *Constantine the Great* to the emperor *Anastasius*. *Two* large extracts only are extant.

Basil of Cilicia, first a presbyter at Antioch, and then bishop of Irenopolis in Cilicia; flourished A.D. 497. He wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* in iii. books, extending from A.D. 450 to A.D. 527; also, *contra Johannem Scythopolitanum*, Libri xvi., accusing him of Manichæism. Neither work is extant.

Candidus, a scrivener to the governors of the province of Isauria, flourished A.D. 496. He wrote *Historiarum Libri* iii., extending from A.D. 457 to A.D. 491. Some extracts, by *Photius*, are all that remain.

Andreas, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, flourished about A.D. 500. He wrote a Commentary on the Apocalypse, which is extant, Gr. and Lat., inter *Opp. Chrysostomi*, tom. viii., ed *Morell*; also *Therapeutica Spiritualis*, of which only some fragments remain — *Tr.*

(32) The entire works of *Leo I.*, [comprising 100 sermons and 141 epistles], were edited with great care by the celebrated presbyter of the Oratory, *Pasch. Quesnell*, Lyons, 1700, 2 vols. fol. [This edition being proscribed by the pope, because the editor defended the cause of *Hilary of Arles*, and the liberties of the Gallican church against *Leo*; a new edition was published

[*Paul*] *Orosius* acquired fame by his *History*, written with a view to confute the cavils of the pagans, and by his books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists.(33) [*John*] *Cassianus*, an unlearned and superstitious man, by his oral communications, his writings, and his institutions, acquainted the Gauls with the mode of living pursued by the monks of Syria and Egypt; and was a leading teacher among those denominated Semipelagians.(34) The *Homilies* of *Maximus* of Turin, which are still extant, are short, but generally neat and pious.(35) *Eucherius* of Lyons, ranks not

by *Cacciari* and the brothers *Ballerini*. *Leo* was a man of extraordinary talents, a good writer, an indefatigable bishop, and very successful in promoting the glory of the see of Rome. It has been said, that he possessed every virtue that was compatible with an unbounded ambition. He was bishop of Rome from A.D. 440 to A.D. 461. In the beginning of his reign, he persecuted the sectarians of Africa, who took refuge in Italy on the conquest of Africa by the Vandals. In 445 commenced his controversy with *Hilary* archbishop of Arles, whom he divested of his rights as a metropolitan, in violation of the liberties of the Gallican church. He also obtained from *Valentinian III.* a decree confirming his usurpations over the Gallic church. In 451 he showed the violence of his passions and the excess of his ambition, by his opposition to that decree of the council of Chalcedon, which raised the bishop of Constantinople to the rank of a patriarch, and very much extended his jurisdiction. In the year 455, he was a protection to the city of Rome, when it was pillaged by *Genesius*, king of the Vandals. See *M. Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xvii., p. 90-169; and *A. Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, vol. ii., p. 7-140.—*Tr.*]

(33) *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionnaire*, tome iii., voce *Orose*. The works of *Orosius* have at length been published, with some medals, by *Sigb. Havercamp*, Leyden, 1738, 4to.—[*Paul Orosius* was a presbyter of Tarragona in Spain. In the year 413, he was sent into Africa to consult *Augustine* respecting the rising sect of the Priscillianists. *Augustine* then put him upon writing his history, which he completed four years afterwards. In the year 415, *Augustine* sent him to Palestine to visit *Jerome* and learn his opinion respecting the origin of souls. He was present at some councils in Palestine, and there opposed the errors of *Pelagius*. On his return to Africa, he brought with him the relics of *St. Stephen*, which were highly valued. He afterwards returned to Spain. The time of his death is unknown. His works, written in good Latin, comprise (1) *Historiarum adversus Paganos Libri vii.*; in which he endeavours to show from the Roman history, that as great calamities had happened in the

empire under the reign of paganism, as under that of Christianity. (2) *Apologeticus contra Pelagianos de arbitrii libertate*. These two works are in the edition of *Havercamp*. (3) His written statement to *Augustine*, in the year 413, which is published among the works of *Augustine*, and is entitled, *Communitorium sive consultatio ad S. Augustinum. de errore Priscillianistarum et Originistarum*.—*Tr.*]

(34) *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tome ii., p. 215, &c. *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiast.*, par *M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 156. The works of *Cassian*, with a prolix Commentary, were published by *Alard. Gazaeus*, latest edition *Francf.*, 1722, fol.—[*John Cassianus*, of Scythian extract, was born at Athens A.D. 351. He early devoted himself to a monastic life; which he pursued, first at Bethlehem, then at Nitria in Egypt, next at Constantinople, where *Chrysostom* made him deacon of a church. On the banishment of *Chrysostom* A.D. 404, the clergy of Constantinople sent *Cassianus* to Italy to solicit aid to their cause from the Roman pontiff. At Rome, *Cassianus* was ordained a presbyter, and there he remained till A.D. 410, when, on the capture of Rome by the Goths, he retired to Marseilles in France. Here he erected two monasteries, one for males and one for females; and thenceforth devoted himself to the furtherance of monkery in Gaul. He commenced author in 424, and died A.D. 448, aged 97 years. He was not a great man, but he was active, pious, and sincere. He was a leading man among the Semipelagians, and held, perhaps, nearly the same sentiments respecting original sin, and grace, and human ability, with the Remonstrants or Arminians of Holland in the 17th century. His works are, (1) *de Institutis Cœnobiiorum Libri xii.*, of which the iv. first books describe the form and regulations of a monastery; and the viii. following treat of as many principal sins. (2) *xiv. Collationes Patrum*; discourses or rather Colloquies, chiefly on monastic virtues. (3) *de Christi incarnatione adversus Nestorium Libri vii.*—*Tr.*]

(35) [*Maximus* was bishop of Turin in Piedmont, from A.D. 422 to A.D. 466. Little is known of his life. His works con-

last among the Latins of this century who treated moral subjects eloquently and well.(36) *Pontius* [*Paulinus*] of Nola, highly esteemed by the ancients for his piety, has recommended himself to posterity by his poems, and by some other things.(37) *Peter*, bishop of Ravenna, acquired the surname of *Chrysologus* on account of his eloquence; and his discourses are not entirely destitute of genius.(38) *Salvianus* was an eloquent but a gloomy and austere writer, who in the vehemence of his declamation against the vices of the times, unwarily discloses the weaknesses and defects of his own character.(39) *Prosper* of Aquitain,(40) and *Marius*

sist of 85 short homilies or sermons. Of these 32 were published among the works of *Ambrose*, and 8 among the discourses of *Augustine*. *Theoph. Raynaud* collected and published 73 of them under the name of the real author, in a volume containing the works of *Leo I.* and of *Peter Chrysologus*; Lyons, 1652, and Paris, 1671, fol. Afterwards, *Mabillon* collected 12 more, which he published in his *Musarum Italicum*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 1, &c. And *Bruno Bruni* published the whole together, Rome, 1784, fol.—*Tr.*]

(36) Concerning *Eucherius*, the Benedictine monks treat largely, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tome ii., p. 275. [He was of an honourable family in Gaul, fond of monkery in his youth, and resided some time in a monastery in the island of Lerins. But he afterwards married, and had two sons, *Saloninus* and *Veranius*, who became bishops. He was bishop of Lyons from A.D. 434 to A.D. 454. His most admired work is his Epistle to Valerianus, on contempt of the world and secular philosophy. Besides this, he wrote in praise of monkery, instructions for his sons, and several homilies. Several works are falsely ascribed to him. The whole were published, *Basil*, 1531, and *Rome*, 1564, 4to, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. vi.—*Tr.*]

(37) See the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tome ii., p. 179. The works of *Paulinus* were published by *J. Bapt. le Brun*, Paris, 1685, 2 vols. 4to. [See note (37), p. 253, on the preceding century, where he is particularly described.—*Tr.*]

(38) See *Agnelli*, *Liber Pontificalis ecclesiæ Ravennatensis*, tom. i., p. 321, ed. *Bachini*.—[*Peter Chrysologus* was an Italian, of a noble family. He was born at Imola, and educated under the bishop of that see. In the year 433, he was made bishop of Ravenna, where he died about A.D. 450. He has left us 147 short Homilies or Sermons; and one Epistle, addressed to *Eutyches* the heretic, in the year 449. His works have been often published; the latest edition is, perhaps, that of *Venice*, 1742, fol.—*Tr.*]

(39) See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tome ii., p. 517. ["The authors of the history, here referred to, give a different account of *Salvian's* character. They acknowledge, that his declamation against the vices of the age in his *Treatise against Avarice*, and his *Discourse concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement: but they represent him notwithstanding as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time."—*Macl.* *Salvian* was a native of Gaul, probably of Cologne; lived long at Treves, and married a pagan lady, who however became a Christian after marriage; had one child, a daughter. At length he removed to the south of France, and became a presbyter at Marseilles, where he lived to a great age. He flourished as early as 440; but was alive, though an old man, in the year 495. See *Gennadius*, (who was a contemporary presbyter of Marseilles), de *Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 67. The works of *Salvian*, now extant, are, (1) *On the Providence and Government of God, and his righteous temporal judgments*, viii. books. (2) *Nine Epistles*. (3) *Against Avarice, especially in clergymen and bishops*, iv. books. His style is barbarous, yet vivid and energetic. His conceptions are clear, his reasoning pungent, and his sentiments for the most part correct. Yet his descriptions are coarse, and often too high coloured, and his positions sometimes untenable. The works of *Salvian* have been often published. The best edition is that of *Steph. Baluze*, Paris, 1669, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(40) For a good account of *Prosper*, see the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 369.—[*Tiro Prosper*, a layman, but a learned theologian, of Aquitain in Gaul, flourished A.D. 444. He was a great admirer and an able defender of the doctrines of *Augustine*, respecting original sin, predestination, and free grace. In the year 426, he addressed a letter to *Augustine*, acquainting him with the incipient progress of Pelagian errors in Gaul, and soliciting him to write against them. In 431, he visited Italy, to procure the aid of the Roman pontiff against these errors; and returned strengthened by

Mercator, (41) are names familiar to every one who has paid attention to the Pelagian and other controversies of this century. *Vincentius* of Lerins has continued his name to posterity, by a short but elegant tract against the sects, which he entitled *Commonitorium*. (42) I designedly pass over *Sidonius Apollinaris*, a tumid writer, though not destitute of eloquence; (43) *Vigilius* of Tapsus; (44) *Arnobius* junior, who commented

a doctrinal letter addressed to the bishops of Gaul. In 433, he wrote his strictures on the 13th *Collatio* of *John Cassianus*, which is an able performance. In 443, *Leo* I. called him to Rome, and made him his private secretary, and employed him in the Pelagian contests of Italy. He was alive in 455; but the time of his death is unknown. He was a man of strong reasoning powers, soundly orthodox, and a good model in controversial writing. Most of his works are in defence of the doctrines of original sin, predestination, and free grace; and especially his two books, (if indeed they are his), *de Vocatione Gentium*, (on the offer of salvation to all men), will be read with interest by the modern theologian. He also composed a *Chronicon*, continuing that of *Eusebius* down to A.D. 455; a *Commentary* on the last 50 Psalms; several letters; and some poems. His works were published, Paris, 1711, fol., and by *Salina*, Rome, 1732, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(41) [*Marius Mercator* was probably an African, yet may have lived some time in Italy. He was undoubtedly a layman, a friend and admirer of *Augustine*, and an active defender of his doctrines, from A.D. 418 to the year 451. His works are almost wholly translations from the Greek fathers, particularly *Nestorius*, *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, *Cyril* of Alexandria, *Proclus*, *Theodoret*, &c., accompanied with prefaces and notes or strictures by the translator. They are all designed to confute either the *Nestorian* or the *Pelagian* errors: and were edited with copious notes, by *Joh. Garner*, Paris, 1673, fol., and still better by *Steph. Baluze*, Paris, 1684, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

(42) A good account of *Vincentius* of Lerins, is found in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 305. [He was born of a noble family, at *Toul* in the French Netherlands; became a soldier, and afterwards a monk at Lerins, where he was made a presbyter. He flourished A.D. 434, and died before the year 450. He was probably a Semipelagian; as may be inferred from his *Objections against the writings and doctrines of Augustine*, which (though lost) are confuted by *Prosper* of Aquitaine. His only surviving work is his *Commonitorium adversus Haereticos*. This he re-wrote, but lost the copy, and therefore added notes to the first draught. It is an

attempt to confute all heresies at once, by showing what are the marks of the true church, as distinguished from all errorists. It has been often published; e. g., by *Baluze*, subjoined to *Salvian's* works, Paris, 1669, 8vo, and Cambridge, 1687, 12mo.—*Tr.*]

(43) [*C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius* was born of a noble family at *Lyons* in France, A.D. 431. His father and grandfather both bore the name of *Apollinaris*, and both were praetorian prefects of the Gallias. After an expensive education, he became a soldier, married the daughter of *Avitus*, who was afterwards emperor, had three children; was captured at the siege of *Lyons*, A.D. 457; yet was advanced to honour by the new emperor *Majorianus*, whom he eulogized in 458; had a statue erected to him, and was advanced to the dignity of count. In the year 467, he went to Rome as legate from the city of Clermont; pronounced a eulogy on the emperor *Anthemius*; was made *prefect* of Rome, and performed his duties so faithfully that he had another statue decreed him, was made a *patriarch* and a *senator* of Rome. In the year 472, he was almost compelled to accept the office of bishop of Clermont in France. He now laid aside all his civil honours, gave up his property to his son, and devoted himself to sacred studies and to his episcopal functions. His influence among the clergy and the churches was very great. When the Goths attacked Clermont, he put himself at the head of the citizens, as their military commander; and when the city was captured in 480, he retired in safety, was restored to his see, and died in the year 482. He has left us numerous Epistles, which he himself digested into nine books; in which form they are published, with one Sermon and 24 poetic effusions interspersed. Several of his works in prose and verse, are lost. His works were published by *Jac. Sirmond*, Paris, 1614, 8vo, and with additional notes, Paris, 1652, 8vo. His Epistles are useful, as throwing light on the history of his times.—*Tr.*]

(44) [*Vigilius* bishop of *Tapsus* in Africa, flourished A.D. 484, at which time he was summoned to appear at Carthage before *Huneric*, the Arian king of the Vandals, and give an account of his faith. He boldly pro-

on the Psalms of David ;(45) *Dracontius* ;(46) and others ;(47) who were of a secondary rank.

fessed orthodoxy ; but the persecution which followed, obliged him to quit Africa, and he retired to Constantinople, and after some years removed to Italy, where he composed several, perhaps the greater part, of his works. To conceal himself from his persecuting enemies, he composed much under borrowed names, and especially that of *Athanasius*. During the middle ages, he was confounded with *Vigilius* of Trent, who flourished at the beginning of this century. His works are, five Books against *Nestorius* and *Eutyches* ; two Dialogues, between *Athanasius* and *Arius*, supposed to have been held at the council of Nice ; three Dialogues between the same ; twelve Books on the Trinity ; a Dialogue on the Trinity, between *Augustine* and *Felicianus*, an Arian ; on the Trinity, against *Varimadus* ; one Book against *Palladius*, an Arian ; Answers to Arian objections ; Dialogue between *Augustine* and *Pascenius*, an Arian. He is likewise supposed to be the author of that Confession of Faith, which is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*. His works were first published as his by *P. F. Chifflet*, Dijon, 1664, 4to.—*Tr.*]

(45) An account of *Arnobius junior*, is given in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 342. [He is called *junior*, to distinguish him from the African *Arnobius*, who lived at the beginning of the preceding century. This *Arnobius junior*, is supposed to have lived in Gaul. He flourished about A.D. 461, and wrote a Commentary on the Psalms ; Notes on some passages in the Gospels ; and a Dispute with *Serapion* of Egypt, respecting the Trinity, the person of Christ, and the consistency of grace with free will. He was a Semipelagian. His works are in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. viii., p. 203, &c.—*Tr.*]

(46) [*Dracontius* was a presbyter and a poet, probably of Spain, who flourished A.D. 440, and was alive in 450. He has left us a Heroic Poem on the Creation, or the Hexæmeron ; and an Elegy on *Theodosius II.* : both published by *J. Sirmond*, Paris, 1619, 8vo ; and in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. ix., p. 724, 729.—*Tr.*]

(47) [Catalogue of Latin writers omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*, extracted chiefly from the *Historia Litteraria* of *Dr. Cave*.

Chromatius bishop of Aquileia, a friend of *Rufinus*, and a defender of *Chrysostom* ; flourished A.D. 401, and died 410. He has left us some Homilies on the beatitudes, Matt. v., and a few Epistles.

Innocent I. bishop of Rome A.D. 402–

417, a firm friend of *Chrysostom*, and strenuous against the *Nestorians* and *Pelagians*. Of 34 epistles published as his, the genuineness of nearly all is questioned.

Zosimus, of Greek extract, bishop of Rome A.D. 417–418 ; famous for his attempt to subject the African churches to his see. He has left us 13 epistles.

Boniface bishop of Rome A.D. 418–423, prosecuted the attempt of *Zosinus*. We have three of his epistles.

Severus bishop of Minorca, flourished A.D. 418. His epistle, describing the conversion of the Jews of Minorca, was published by *Baronius*, Annals, ad. ann. 418.

Julian, an Italian bishop, born before A.D. 386, and died about the year 440 or 450. He studied under *Pelagius* ; became a deacon, lector, husband, and bishop of a small town among the Hirpini. In the year 417, he came out an open defender of Pelagianism ; in 420 he was condemned ; went to Constantinople, and thence to Cilicia, where he lived long with *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, and devoted himself to writing in defence of his sentiments. In 423, he was condemned by a synod of Cilician bishops ; returned to Italy in 424, hoping to recover his see ; failed, and went again to Constantinople, to beg the interference of the emperor ; but here *Mercator's* Commonitorium to *Theodosius II.* met him, and blasted his prospects. Being driven from Constantinople, and condemned in a council at Rome A.D. 431, he pretended to renounce his errors, and applied to the Roman pontiff in 439 to restore him to his see ; but in vain.—He was a man of superior talents, well acquainted with the Scriptures, and so eloquent that he was styled the *Roman Demosthenes*. He was likewise famed for his piety and his benevolence to the poor. But he was accused of dissembling as to his sentiments, and of using bitter language towards his adversaries. Large extracts are preserved from his Epistles, his Commentary on the Canticles, and his twelve books against the first and second books of *Augustine* on marriage.

Priscus Fastidius, a British bishop, flourished A.D. 420. He has left us a tract on a Christian life and widowhood, addressed to a pious widow ; extant among the works of *Augustine*, tom. ix.

Ecodius, bishop of Uzala in Africa, an intimate friend of *Augustine*, flourished A.D. 420. Four of his Epistles to *Augustine*, and one Book de Fide contra Manichæos, are extant, among the works of *Augustine*.

Isidorus, bishop of Cordova in Spain.

flourished A.D. 420, and died A.D. 430. He was probably the author of four books of allegories, or commentaries on all the Books of Kings, extant among the works of *Isidorus Hispalensis*.

Celestine, bishop of Rome A.D. 423–432, and active in the Nestorian contests. He has left us 14 epistles.

Lupus, bishop of Troyes in France, flourished A.D. 427. He was sent by the Gallic bishops to Britain in 429, to root out Pelagianism; was successful, and returned in 430; and died A.D. 479. He has been pronounced one of the greatest men of his age. Two of his epistles are extant.

Pisidius or *Possidonius*, bishop of Calama, near Hippo in Africa; flourished A.D. 430. He was an intimate friend of *Augustine*; and wrote his life, and a catalogue of his works, still extant among the works of *Augustine*.

Hilary, bishop of Arles, born A.D. 401, became a monk of Lerins, and was made bishop in 430, and died in 449. As metropolitan of Arles, he deposed *Celidonius* bishop of Vienne; who appealed to Rome, and was supported by *Leo* I.; which involved *Hilary* in war with *Leo* all their lives. He wrote the Life of St. Honoratus, his predecessor; Heroic Poems on Genesis; one Epistle to *Eucherius* of Lyons; two others to *Augustine*; and an account of the miracles of St. *Genesius*: all which were published by the Benedictines, Paris, 1693, fol., and by *Joh. Salina*, Rome, 1731, 8vo.

Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, flourished A.D. 431. His Epistle to the council of Ephesus, and another to the Spanish bishops, against Nestorius, are extant in *Baronius*, and in other collections.

Sixtus III., bishop of Rome A.D. 432–440, has left us several epistles. The three books on riches, chastity, false teachers, &c., are erroneously ascribed to him.

Adrian, who lived perhaps about A.D. 450, wrote an *Isagoge* (Introduction) in *S. Scripturam*, which is extant in the *Critici Londinenses*, tom. viii.

Maximus, a Gallic monk, abbot of *Lerins* in 426, and bishop of *Riez* in France A.D. 433, lived till 451 or longer, and wrote several *Homilies*, which are extant among those of *Eusebius* of Emesa, and *Eucherius* of Lyons.

Claudius Marius Victor, or *Victorinus*, a rhetorician and poet of Marseilles; flourished A.D. 434, and died before A.D. 450. He wrote a poetic commentary on *Genesis*, to the death of Abraham; a poetic epistle to the abbot *Solomon* on the corrupt morals of the age; both extant, Paris, 1560, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. viii., p. 580.

Calius Sedulius, a Scotchman and poet, who flourished A.D. 434. He studied in Italy, became a presbyter, and perhaps a bishop. His works were collected, by *Tur. Ruf. Astcrius*, towards the close of the century; comprising *Carmen Paschale*, (on the miracles of Christ), in five books; *Veteris et Novi Test. Collatio*, an Elegiac poem; *Pæan Alphabeticus de Christo*, in Iambic measure, (on the Life of Christ); and *Paschalis Operis Libri v.*, in prose. An *Exposition of all the Ep. of Paul*, is falsely ascribed to him. The works of *Sedulius* have been published repeatedly, and are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. vi.

Valerianus, a bishop in the Maritime Alps; flourished A.D. 439, and was alive in 455. His 20 *Homilies* and an *Epistle*, were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris, 1612, 8vo, also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. viii.

Eustathius, flourished A.D. 440, the neat Latin translator of *St. Basil's* nine *Homilies* on the *Hexæmeron*; extant among the works of *Basil the Great*.

Philippus, a presbyter, and disciple of *Jerome*; flourished A.D. 440, and died A.D. 455. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, in three books; published, Basil, 1527, 4to and fol. It has been ascribed both to *Beda* and to *Jerome*.

Idatius or *Hydatius*, a Spanish bishop, who flourished A.D. 445, and died A.D. 468. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from A.D. 379 to A.D. 428, and afterwards continued it to A.D. 467; first published entire, by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris, 1619, 8vo; and since, in the works of *Sirmond*, Paris, 1696, and Venice, 1729. It is barbarous in style, and frequently inaccurate as to facts; yet affords valuable aid in tracing the movements of the Goths and Suevi.

Zachæus, the reputed author of iii. Books of discussion, between *Zachæus* a Christian, and *Apollonius* a pagan, in regard to Christianity. The book was probably written about A.D. 450, and is published in *L. Dacherii* *Spicilegium*, tom. x.

Salonius, son of *Eucherius* bishop of Lyons, and himself a Gallic bishop, flourished A.D. 453. He wrote an *Exposition of the Parables of Solomon*; and a *mystical Paraphrase on Ecclesiastes*; both extant in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. viii.

Victorius or *Victorinus*, a Gallic mathematician, flourished A.D. 457; author of a *Paschal Canon*, in two parts; the first part exhibits the principles and the method of calculating Easter; the second is a table of Easter days, from A.D. 28 to A.D. 457. This *Canon* was recommended by the council of Orleans A.D. 541, and was first pub-

lished by *Aegid. Bucherius*, Antwerp, 1634, folio.

Hilary, bishop of Rome A.D. 461–467. He was the bishop of Rome's legate to the council of Ephesus in 449. *Twelve* of his *Epistles* are extant.

Paulinus Petricordius, or Vesuntius, (i. e., of Besançon), a Gallic poet, who flourished A.D. 461, and is often confounded with *Paulinus* of Nola. He wrote, *de Vita Sti. Martini Libri* vi., an uninteresting poem; extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. vi., and published by *Daunius*, with notes, Lips., 1686, 8vo.

Claudius Mamertus, a Gallic poet, a presbyter, and assistant to the bishop of Vienne; flourished A.D. 462. He wrote *de Statu Animi Libri* iii.; two *Epistles*; a *Poem against various errors*; and a *Hymn on the Crucifixion*; all extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. vii.

Simplicius, bishop of Rome A.D. 467–483. He was much engaged in contests with the eastern patriarchs, and has left us 19 *Epistles*; extant in Concilior., tom. iv.

Ruricius senior, bishop of Limoges, in France, flourished A.D. 470, but was alive in 506. He has left us ii. Books of *Epistles*; published by *H. Causius*, Antiq. Lectiones, tom. v. (or tom. i. of new ed.), and in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. viii.

Remigius, bishop of Rheims A.D. 471–533. He baptized *Clovis*, king of the Franks, with many of his lords; was a man of note; and has left us *five Epistles*, together with *his will*. The *Exposition* of Paul's *Epistles*, attributed to him, is not his.

Faustus, abbot of *Lerins*, and then bishop of *Riez* in France, A.D. 472–480 or 485; a Semipelagian. His works are, *de Gratia Dei et libero Arbitrio, Libri* ii., with several *Sermons, Epistles, and Tracts*; collected in Biblioth. Patr., tom. viii.

Felix, bishop of Rome A.D. 483–492; was much in controversy with the eastern patriarchs. *Fifteen* of his *Epistles* are extant.

Victor Vitensis, an orthodox African bishop, who fled to Constantinople A.D. 487; and there composed a *History of the perse-*

cutions in Africa under *Geneseric* and *Huneric*, kings of the Vandals. It was published, with *Optatus Milevitanus*, Paris, 1569, 8vo; with *Vigilius Tapsensis*, Dijon, 1664, 4to; and in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. viii.

Alcimus Ecdicius Avitus, bishop of Clermont A.D. 490–523. He has left us five poetic Books, *on the creation and fall of man, the flood, and the passage of the Red Sea*; a poem *in praise of Virginity*; 87 *Epistles*; and some *Sermons*; published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris, 1643; and in the Biblioth. Patrum, tom. ix.

Gelasius, bishop of Rome A.D. 492–496. *Sixteen* of his *Epistles*, and fragments of various other works, are extant. The famous decree of a Roman council, A.D. 494, *de Libris Canonicis, Ecclesiasticis, et Apocryphis*, ascribed to *Gelasius*, is of dubious authenticity.

Gennadius, a presbyter of Marseilles, flourished A.D. 495, and wrote *de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, or a catalogue of authors, continuing *Jerome's* Catalogue, from the year 393 to A.D. 495. His book *de Fide*, and his *Life of Jerome*, are also extant. But his eight Books against all the heresies, his six Books against *Nestorius*, his three Books against *Pelagius*, his *Tract* on the Millennium, and his translations from the Greek fathers, are lost.

Rusticus E'pidius, physician to *Theodoric* king of the Goths, flourished about A.D. 498, and has left 24 *Epigrams* on scriptural facts, and a *Poem* on the *Benefits of Christ*.

Juhanus Pomerius, of Mauritania; a teacher of rhetoric at Arles, and a presbyter there; flourished A.D. 498. His viii. Books *de Anima*, and several smaller works, are lost. But his iii. Books, *de vita Contemplativa*, are extant, among the works of *Prosper*; to whom they have been wrongly ascribed.

Synmachus, bishop of Rome A.D. 498–514, famous for his excommunication of the emperor *Anastasius*, has left us 12 *Epistles*. —[Tr.]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Many Points in Theology better ascertained.—§ 2. Increase of Superstition.—§ 3. Interpretation of the Scriptures.—§ 4. Most of the Interpreters incompetent.—§ 5. Some were more able.—§ 6. State of Dogmatic Theology.—§ 7. Theological Disputants.—§ 8. Their Faults.—§ 9. Hence, supposititious Books.—§ 10. Moral Writers.—§ 11. Mystics.—§ 12. Superstition of the Stylites.—§ 13. Further Defects of the Moralists.—§ 14. *Jerome's* Controversy with *Vigilantius*.—§ 15. Controversies respecting *Origen*.

§ 1. IN the controversies which in this century agitated nearly all Christendom, many points of theology were more fully explained and more accurately stated and defined, than they had been before. Thus it was with the doctrine concerning *Christ*, his person and natures; and those of the innate depravity of the human soul, the natural ability of men to live and act as the law of God requires, the necessity of divine grace in order to salvation, human liberty, and the like. For that devout and reverential simplicity of the first ages of the church, which taught men to believe when God speaks, and to obey when God commands, appeared to most of the doctors of this age to be unphilosophical and becoming only in the vulgar. Many of those however who attempted to explain and illustrate these doctrines, opened the way rather for disputation than for a rational faith and a holy life; for they did not so much explain, as involve in greater obscurity and darken with ambiguous terms and incomprehensible distinctions, the deep mysteries of revealed religion. And hence arose abundant matter for difficulties, contentions, and animosities, which flowed down to succeeding ages, and which can scarcely be removed by the efforts of human power. It hardly need be remarked, that some, while pressing their adversaries, incautiously fell into errors of an opposite character which were no less dangerous.

§ 2. The superstitious notions and human devices, by which religion was before much clogged, were very considerably augmented. The aid of departed saints was implored with supplications by vast multitudes, and no one censured this absurd devotion. Nor did the question which afterwards occasioned much debate, namely, in what way the prayers of mortals could reach the ears of residents in heaven, present any difficulties to the Christians of those times. For they did not suppose the souls of departed saints to be so confined to the celestial mansions, as not to have liberty of paying visits to mortals, and of travelling over various regions at their pleasure. These unimodied spirits were supposed very frequently to visit and to be much attached to the places where their bodies were buried. And this opinion, derived to Christians from the Greeks and Romans, drew a great conflux of supplicants to the sepulchres of the saints.(1) The im-

(1) *Lactantius*, *Divinar. Instit.*, lib. i., p. 164. *Hesiod*, *Opp. et Dier.*, v., 122. With which compare *Sulpitius Severus*, *Epist.* ii., p. 371, *Dial.* ii., c. 13, p. 474, *Dial.* iii., p.

512. *Æneas Gaza*, *Theophrastus*, p. 65. *Macarius*, in *Ja. Tollii Insignia itine-*ris Italici, p. 197, and other writers of that age.

ages of those who were in reputation for sanctity while alive, were now honoured with extraordinary devotion in several places; and there were those who believed, what the pagan priests had maintained respecting the statues of *Jupiter* and *Mercury*,⁽²⁾ namely, that those inhabitants of heaven kindly afforded their presence in these their images. The bones of martyrs and the sign of the cross, were supposed to be the most sovereign remedy against the assaults of demons and all other calamities, and to have power not only to heal diseases of the body but likewise those of the mind.⁽³⁾ Of the public processions, the holy pilgrimages,⁽⁴⁾ the superstitious services paid by the living to the souls of the dead, the multiplication and extravagant veneration of temples, chapels, and altars, and innumerable other proofs of degenerate piety, I forbear to speak particularly. As no one in those times objected to Christians' retaining the opinions of their pagan ancestors respecting the soul, heroes, demons, temples, and the like, and their transferring them into their devotions; and as no one proposed utterly to abolish the ancient pagan institutions, but only to alter them somewhat and purify them; it was unavoidable, that the religion and the worship of Christians should in this way become corrupted. This also I will add, that the doctrine of the purification of souls after death by means of some sort of fire, which afterwards became so great a source of wealth to the clergy, acquired in this age more development and a more imposing aspect.⁽⁵⁾

§ 3. The number of those who devoted their talents to the explanation of the Scriptures, was not so great as in the preceding century when there was less of controversy among Christians; and yet the number was not small. I pass over those who expounded but one or only a few books of scripture; *Victor* of Antioch, *Polychronius*, *Philo* of Carpathus, *Isidore* of Cordova, *Salonius*, and *Andreas* of Cæsarea. The two most distinguished interpreters of this century, who explained a great part of the sacred volume and not altogether without success, were *Theodoret* bishop of Cyrus, and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. Both possessed genius and learning, and neither would follow in the footsteps of preceding expositors without some reason. The expositions of the former are before the public;⁽⁶⁾ those of the latter lie concealed in the East among the Nestorians, and for various reasons are worthy to see the light.⁽⁷⁾ *Cyril* of Alexandria deserves a

(2) *Clementina*, Homil. x. in Patr. Apostol., tom. i., p. 697. *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes, lib. vi., p. 254, &c. *Casp. Barthius*, ad Rutilium Numantian., p. 250.

(3) *Prudentius*, Hymn. xi. de Coronis, p. 150, 151. *Sulpitius Severus*, Epist. i., p. 364. *Ancas Gazeus*, Theophrastus, p. 173, ed. Barth.

(4) [These pilgrimages were then so common, that some Christians fell into absurdities truly ridiculous. They journeyed quite to Arabia, in order to see the dunghill on which the diseased *Job* sat, and to kiss the ground which had absorbed his precious blood; as *Chrysostom* informs us, (Homily v. to the Antiochians), where he says, in his rhetorical way, that the dunghill of *Job* was more venerable than the throne of a king.—*Schl.*]

(5) On this subject, *Augustine* deserves especially to be consulted, de octo quaestionibus ad Dulcitium Liber, c. xiii., Opp., tom. vi., p. 128; de fide et operibus, c. xvi., p. 182; de fide, spe et caritate, § 118, p. 222. Exposition of Psalm xxxv., § iii., &c.

(6) See *Rich. Simon*, Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. Test., cap. xxii., p. 314, and Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiast., par *M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 180, [and note (22), p. 330, above.—*Tr.*]

(7) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana, tom. iii., § ii., p. 227. *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiast., par *M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 108, 677. [See also note (26), p. 331, above.—*Tr.*]

place among the interpreters; but a far more honourable one is due to *Isidore* of Pelusium, whose Epistles contain much that tends to elucidate and explain the Holy Scriptures.(8)

§ 4. Most of these interpreters, whether Greeks or Latins, every where copy after *Origen*; and despising the genuine and obvious meaning of the scriptures, search after abstruse senses or what the Latins of that age called *mysteria*, in the plainest passages and sentences of the Bible. Some of the Greeks indeed, and in particular *Theodoret*, laboured not unsuccessfully in explaining the pages of the New Testament: which we may ascribe to their skill in the Greek language, with which they had been familiar from their infancy. But upon the Hebrew Scriptures, neither the Greeks nor the Latins cast much light. Nearly all who attempted to explain them, making no use of their judgment, applied the whole either to *Christ* and his benefits, or to *Anti-Christ* and his wars and desolations, and to the kindred subjects.

§ 5. Here and there one, however, more wise and sagacious than the rest, ventured to point out a safer path. This is evident from the Epistles of *Isidore* Pelusiota, who in various places, censures in a pertinent manner those who disregarding the *historic* sense referred all the narrative and prophetic parts of the Old Testament to *Christ*: and yet he himself was by no means entirely free from the fault of his age, the love and pursuit of allegories. No one went farther in censuring the imitators of *Origen*, than *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia. He not only wrote a book *concerning Allegory and History, against Origen*;(9) but also in his own *Commentaries* on the Prophets of the Old Testament, ventured to explain most of their predictions with reference to events in ancient history.(10) And this his method of explaining the Old Testament, raised as much ill-will against him, perhaps, as those other sentiments which brought on him the charge of heresy. The example of this excellent man was followed especially by the Nestorians;(11) nor have they yet ceased to follow it, for to this day they preserve his books with care, and venerate the man as a saint of the highest order.

§ 6. It is very evident, that the doctrines of religion were not propounded by most persons with due simplicity and purity, but were sometimes expanded beyond what is revealed, were anatomized with too great art and subtilty, and were supported not so much by scriptural evidence as by the authority and reasonings of the ancient doctors. I know of no one who gave a complete system of Christian doctrines in a single work, unless *Nicæas* of Romæcia did so, in the *six books of instruction for Neophytes* which he is

(8) Concerning both, see *Rich. Simon*, *Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du N. Test.*, c. xxi., p. 300, &c. [For some account of *Cyril*, see note (21), p. 329, and concerning *Isidore*, note (23), p. 330, above.—*Tr.*]

(9) *Facundus* Hermianensis, *de tribus capitulis*, lib. iii., c. 6. *Liberatus*, *Breviarium*, c. xxiv.

(10) *Acta Concilii Constantinop.* ii., seu *Oecumenici* v., in tom. iii., p. 58. *Concilior.*, ed. *Harduin*.

(11) One witness, among others, is *Cosmas* Indicopleustes, a writer of the 6th cen-

tury, who is known to have been a Nestorian. For he says, in his *Topographia*, lib. v., (p. 224, 225, of the *Collectio nova Patrum Græcor.* published by *Bernh. Montfaucon*): “Among all the Psalms of David, only four refer to *Christ* :” and to confirm this sentiment, he does not hesitate to declare, (p. 227), “That the writers of the New Testament, when they apply the prophecies of the Old Testament to *Jesus Christ*, follow the words rather than the sense.” [See also *C. W. F. Waich*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., p. 880.—*Tr.*]

said to have composed.(12) But it has been already observed, that various doctrines of religion were laboriously explained, especially in the controversial works against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

§ 7. Of controversial writers, a great number can be mentioned : and indeed many such were required, by the great number of controversies. The worshippers of the pagan gods and images, were vigorously assailed by *Theodoret*, in his book *De curandis Græcorum affectionibus*, which displays much genius and erudition ; by *Orientius*, in his *Commonitorium* ; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Disputation* between *Zachacus* and *Apollonius*.(13) To these may be added *Philip* of Side, and *Philostorgius* ; of whom the former wrote against *Julian*, and the latter against *Porphry*.(14) The Jews were confuted by *Basil*, of Seleucia ;(15) by *Gregentius*, in his *Disputation with Herbanus* ; and by *Evagrius*, in his *Dialogue between Theophilus and a Jew*. Against all the heretics, something was attempted by *Vononius*, an African ; by *Syagrius*, in his tract *de Fide* ; by *Gennadius* of Marseilles ; and, best of all, by *Theodoret*.(16) in his work *de Fabulis Hæreticorum*. Those who attacked only individual sects are here omitted.

§ 8. Those who contended against the Christian sectaries, followed the rules of the ancient sophists, and strangely, also the practice of the Roman courts, rather than the examples and instructions of *Christ* and his apostles. In the Roman courts, very difficult and doubtful points were decided according to the opinions of certain ancient jurists. If these happened to disagree, that opinion was preferred which was maintained by the greatest number, or by the jurists of most learning and reputation.(17) It was very prejudicial to the interests of truth, that this usage of the Roman courts was adopted as a rule in the controversies of Christians on subjects of religion, and followed in the deliberations of the councils of this century. For by it, that was sanctioned and regarded as confirmed, which had been judged true and certain by the majority or by the most learned and distinguished of the doctors of former times. This appears from nearly all the Acts of Councils now extant. The other faults of the theological disputants, may be easily inferred from what has now been stated.

§ 9. This imitation of the Roman courts in religious discussions, stimulated very much the base audacity of those, who did not blush to palm

(12) *Gennadius* Massiliens. de *Scriptoribus Ecclesiast.*, cap. 22, p. 14, ed. Fabric. [The work is lost ; but from the account of *Gennadius*, it was no *System of Theology*.—*Tr.*]

(13) For an account of *Orientius* and *Evagrius*, see the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, tom. ii., p. 121 and 252. [*Orientius*, called also *Orontius* and *Oresius*, was bishop of *Aux* in France, perhaps also of *Tarragona* in Spain. His *Commonitorium*, which is written in heroic verse, was published, Book I., by *Martin Delrio*, Antwerp, 1600, and Book II., by *Edm. Martene*, in his *Nova Collectio operum ecclesiast. Vet.*, Paris, 1700—This *Evagrius* is not the noted *Evagrius Scholasticus* of the sixth century, but was a French priest,

and a disciple of *St. Martin*. His *Altercatio Simonis Judæi et Theophili Christiani*, is found in *Martene's Anecdota* ; and his *Consultationes, seu Deliberationes Zachæi Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi*, is in the *Spicilegium of D'Archery*, tom. x.—*Schl.*]

(14) [Neither of the works here mentioned is extant.—*Tr.*]

(15) [For some account of this *Basil*, and of his writings, see note (28), p. 332, above.—*Tr.*]

(16) [An account of *Theodoret*, and of his writings, is given in note (22), p. 330, above.—*Tr.*]

(17) See *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. i., tit. iv., de responsis prudentum, p. 32, ed. *Ritter*.

their own spurious productions on the great men of former times, and even on *Christ* himself, and his apostles; so that they might be able, in the councils and in their books, to oppose names against names and authorities against authorities. The whole Christian church in this century was overwhelmed with these disgraceful fictions. And this, it is said, occasioned the Roman pontiff *Gelasius*, to assemble at Rome a convention of bishops from the whole western empire, and after examining the books which were professedly the works of persons of the highest authority, to draw up that famous decree, by which so many *apocryphal* books are stripped of their false reputation. That something of this kind was actually done, cannot well be denied; but men of superior learning maintain, that this pretended Decree of *Gelasius* is of no better authority than those books which it condemns; that is, they believe that it was not the production of *Gelasius*, but of some one who abused his name. (18)

§ 10. Among those who treated on the subject of morals, *Eucherius*, *Salvian*, and *Nilus* stand conspicuous. The epistle of *Eucherius* especially, on *Contempt of the World and Secular Philosophy*, will recommend itself to every good man, both by its style and its matter. The short pieces of *Mark* the hermit, breathe a spirit of piety; but do not give pleasure by either the selectness of the matter, the justness of the arrangement, or the solidity of the reasoning. *Fastidius* composed various tracts concerning moral duties and virtues, which are all lost, [except his tract on a *Christian Life and Widowhood*, addressed to a pious widow; which is preserved among the works of *Augustine*, tom. ix.—*Tr.*] The productions of *Diadochus*, *Prosper*, and *Severianus* in this department, are interesting, with a few exceptions, for the truth and terseness of the thoughts; but they will afford little satisfaction to one fond of solid argumentation and well-digested composition. Indeed, it was a fault common to nearly all the moral writers of those times, that they had no idea of a regular distribution of their subject into parts, nor of a recurrence to first principles.

§ 11. But the candid might put up with this fault, and ascribe it to the infelicity of the times, did they not see other injuries done to the cause of piety by inconsiderate men. In the first place, the *Mystics* as they are called, who pretended to be more perfect than other Christians, drew many every where among the weak and thoughtless, and especially in the eastern provinces, who were allured by the appearance of their extraordinary and self-denying piety, to become of their party. And it is incredible, what rigorous and severe laws they imposed on themselves, in order to appease God and deliver the *celestial spirit* from the bondage of this *mortal body*. To live among wild beasts,—nay, in the *manner* of these beasts; to roam about like madmen, in desert places, and without garments; to feed their emaciated bodies with hay and grass; to shun the converse and even the sight of men; to stand motionless in certain places, for many

(18) *Jo. Pearson*, *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, pt. i., c. iv., p. 189, &c. *Wm. Cave*, *Historia Litter. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*, p. 260. *Urb. Godofr. Siberus*, *Praef. ad Enchiridion Sexti*, p. 79, and others. [This decree is ascribed, by most of the MSS. to *Gelasius* I., but by some to *Damasus*, and by others to *Hormisdas*. It is not quoted by any writer before the 9th century. It mentions

some books, which were not in being, in the age of *Gelasius*. And it contains some sentiments and arguments which savour of a later age.—It may be found in perhaps all the larger Collections of Councils; in *Binnius*, vol. ii., in *Labbé*, vol. iv., in *Harduin*, vol. ii., in *Mansi*, *Supplem.*, vol. i., also in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, *Deeret. Gratian.* pt. i., distinct. xv., cap. iii.—*Tr.*]

years, exposed to the weather ; to shut themselves up in confined cabins, till life ended ;—this was accounted piety ; this, the true method of eliciting the [spark of] Deity from the secret recesses of the soul.(19) The greater part of these people were influenced, not so much by arguments and assignable reasons, as by either a natural propensity to melancholy and austerity, or by the example and opinions of others. For there are diseases of the mind as well as of the body, which can spread like a pestilence. Yet there were some who gave systematic precepts for this austere mode of living ; for instance, among the Latins, *Julianus Pomerius*, in his three Books *de vita contemplativa* ; and among the Syrians, many ; whose names it would be needless to mention.

§ 12. Among these examples of religious fatuity, none acquired greater veneration and applause, than those who were called *Pillar-Saints* (*Sancti Columnares*), or in Greek, *Stylitae* ; persons of a singular spirit and genius who stood motionless on the tops of lofty columns during many years, and to the end of life, to the great astonishment of the ignorant multitude. The author of this institution in the present century, was *Simeon* of Sisan, a Syrian ; who was first a shepherd, and then a monk ; and who, in order to be nearer heaven, spent thirty-seven years in the most uncomfortable manner, on the tops of five different pillars, of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits elevation ; and in this way, procured for himself immense fame and veneration.(20) His example was afterwards fol-

(19) See *Moschus*, *Pratum spirituale* ; *Palladius*, *Hist. Lausiaca* ; *Sulpitius Severus*, *Dial. i.*, and others.

(20) See the *Acta Sanctor.* for the month of January, tom. i., p. 261, &c., where (p. 277) the very reason I have mentioned for his living in this manner is expressly stated. *Theodore*t also indicates the same, by saying that *Simeon* desired gradually to increase the altitude of his pillar, that he might get nearer to heaven. *Tillemont*, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. xv., p. 347, ed. Paris. The *Acta S. Simeonis Stylitae*, are most fully related, in *Steph. Evod. Asseman's Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental.*, vol. ii., p. 227, Rome, 1748, fol.—[This *Simeon*, we are told, was born at *Sisan* in Syria, about A.D. 390. At the age of 13, while tending his father's sheep, he heard a public exposition of Luke vi., 21, 25, ("Blessed are ye that weep now, &c. But woe unto you that laugh now, &c."), which determined him to become a monk. Having therefore passed a novitiate of two years, he removed to a monastery near Antioch, where he lived 10 years. Here his abstinence and his voluntary mortifications were so excessive, as to draw on him censure from the other monks. He once swathed himself from his loins to his neck, with a rigid well-rope of palm, during 10 days ; which caused his whole body to fester and discharge blood. Being expelled the monastery for such austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, and let himself down into

a dry cave. After five days, the repenting monks sought him out, drew him forth from the cavern, and restored him to their fellowship. But not long after, he retired to a little cell, at the foot of a mountain near Antioch, and there immured himself three years. During this period, having caused his den to be stopped up with earth, he remained buried for 40 days, without eating or drinking ; and when disinterred was found nearly dead. So pleased was he with this experiment, that he afterwards kept such a fast annually, as long as he lived. He next removed to the top of the mountain, where he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become very great ; and crowds of admiring visitors of all ranks and characters thronged around him. He instructed them, healed their diseases, and converted heretics, pagans, and Jews, in great numbers. Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd, he erected a pillar on which he might stand ; elevated, at first, six cubits ; then, 12, 22, 36, and at last 40 cubits. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood, day and night, and in all weathers. Through the night, and till 9 A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands, and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A by-stander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations ; and he counted till they amounted to 1214. At 9 o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear

lowed, though not fully equalled, by many persons in Syria and Palestine, who were led to it either by their ignorance of true religion or by their love of fame; and this stupid form of religion continued in the East, quite down to the 12th century, when at length it was entirely abolished.(21) The Latins had wisdom enough not to copy after the Syrians and Orientals in this matter. And when one *Wulfilaicus* built himself such a pillar in the German territory of Treves, and wished to live upon it in the manner of *Simeon*, the neighbouring bishops pulled down the pillar, and forbid the man from pursuing his object.(22)

§ 13. Those who undertook to give religious instruction to the less advanced Christians, were at more pains to inculcate and recommend the external signs of religion and exercises of the body, than to promote that real holiness which has its seat in the soul. And in this, many went so far, that they enjoined an extreme of *austere virtue* little short of the senseless piety of the *Mystics*. According to the sentiments of *Salvian* and others, no one can become truly and perfectly holy, unless he abandons altogether his property and honours, contemns matrimony, banishes all hilarity from his mind, and subjects his body to a variety of mortifications and painful sensations. As there were few who could bear the severity of these rules, veneration for the senseless or fanatical persons, the pious fools, to whose temperament these rules were adapted, advanced astonishingly, and saints sprung up like mushrooms.

§ 14. Some few dared to strike at the root of the growing superstition, and to recall men from vain and fictitious piety to that which is genuine. But these were soon bidden to hold their peace, by others who were more numerous, in higher reputation, and possessed of greater influence.(23) An example we have in *Vigilantius*, a presbyter of Gallic extract but resident in Spain, a learned and eloquent man. After a journey to Palestine and Egypt, returning home near the beginning of this century, he issued several tracts, in which he taught and inculcated many things contrary to the opinions of the age. Among other things, he denied that the

and answer their questions, to send messengers and write letters, &c., for he took concern in the welfare of all the churches, and corresponded with bishops and even with emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God, till the following day. He generally ate but once a week; never slept; wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long; and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner, he is reported to have spent 37 years; and at last, in his 69th year, to have expired unobserved, in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him till after three days; when *Antony*, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit was departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odour. His remains were borne, in great pomp, to Antioch, in order to be the safeguard of that unvalled town: and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated, that it was liter-

ally enclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. *Simeon* was so averse from women, that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him; and he now restored her to life, for a short time, that she might see him and converse with him a little before she ascended to heaven.—Such is the story, gravely told us by the greatest writers of that age; and as gravely repeated, in modern times, by the Catholic historians.—*Tr.]*

(21) *Sec Urb. Godofr. Siber*, Diss. de Sanctis Columnaribus, Lips., 4to, and *Carol. Majell*, Diss. de Stylitis; in *Asseman's Acta Martyr. Orient. et Occident.*, tom. ii., p. 246, where there is a copperplate of *Simeon's* pillar.

(22) *Gregory Turonensis*, *Historia Francor.*, lib. viii., c. xv., p. 387, &c.

(23) *Augustine* himself complains of this, in his noted *epistle* cxix. *ad Januarium*.

tombs and the bones of the martyrs were worthy of any religious worship, and therefore censured pilgrimages to places accounted sacred: he ridiculed the miracles reported as occurring in the temples consecrated to martyrs, and condemned the practice of keeping vigils in these temples: he said, that the custom of burning wax candles in the daytime at the sepulchres of the martyrs, was unwisely borrowed by Christians from the ancient superstition of the pagans: he maintained, that prayers addressed to departed saints, were fruitless: he treated with contempt the [prevailing] fasts, the celibacy of the clergy, and the monastic life: and he maintained, that neither those who distributed all their goods among the poor and lived in voluntary poverty, nor those who sent portions of their property to Jerusalem, performed an act pleasing and acceptable to God. To some of the Gallic and Spanish bishops these sentiments were not offensive. But *Jerome*, the most renowned monk of that age, attacked this bold religious reformer with so much acrimony, that he readily saw he must be silent, if he would have his life and safety. This effort therefore to check the reigning superstition, was crushed in its commencement.(24) The good man's name still remains in the catalogues of *heretics*, admitted by such as follow the decisions of antiquity rather than their own judgment or the decisions of the holy scriptures.

§ 15. The contests, moved in Egypt near the close of the preceding century respecting *Origen*, were in this century prosecuted at the court of Constantinople with little of either prudence or decency. Some monks of Nitria, being banished from Egypt on account of *Origen*, took refuge at Constantinople; and were treated by *John Chrysostom*, the bishop of that city, with candour and kindness. As soon as this was known by *Theophilus* of Alexandria, he began to plot against *Chrysostom*; and sending the renowned *Epiphanius* with several other bishops to Constantinople, he endeavoured to deprive that most eloquent prelate of his office. The time was a favourable one for his purpose; for *Chrysostom*, by the strictness of his discipline and by the severity with which he lashed the vices of the times, and particularly those of some ladies of the court, had incurred the most violent resentment of many, and especially of *Eudoxia*, the wife of *Arcadius* the emperor. *Eudoxia* therefore, being enraged, invited *Theophilus* and the Egyptian bishops to come to Constantinople, to assemble a council, and inquire into the religious sentiments, the morals, and the official conduct of *Chrysostom*. This council, which was held in the suburbs of Chalcedon in the year 403, and had *Theophilus* for its president, declared *Chrysostom* unworthy of the episcopal office, and decreed his banishment, assigning, among other causes, his too great partiality for *Origen* and the followers of *Origen*. The people of Constantinople, who were exceedingly attached to their bishop, became tumultuous, and impeded the execution of this unjust sentence. But the tumult subsiding, the same judges the next year, A.D. 404, in order to

(24) *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire historique, Article *Vigilantius*. *Jean Barbeyrac*, de la Morale des Peres, p. 252. *Gerh. Joh Vossius*, Theser Historico-Theologicæ, p. 170. Histoire litteraire de la France, tome ii., p. 57, &c. [That *Vigilantius* was an honest and correct theologian, and that his name

ought to be erased from the list of *heretics*, appears highly probable, from a candid examination of the whole subject. See *C. W. F. Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iii., p. 673-704, and *Vogel's* Disputation before Dr. *Walch*, Gottingen, 1756, de *Vigilantio hæretico orthodoxo*.—*Tr.*]

gratify their own enmity and that of *Eudoxia*, renewed their sentence under another pretext; and *Chrysostom*, surrendering himself to his enemies, went into banishment at *Cucusus*, a city of Cilicia; where he died three years after.(25) His departure was followed by a great insurrection of the *Johannists*, (for so his partisans were called), which the edicts of *Honorius* with difficulty suppressed.(26) That the proceedings against *Chrysostom* were most unjust, no one doubts; yet it was a fault in him, that he determined to avail himself of the elevation decreed to the bishops of his see by the council of Constantinople, and to assume the prerogatives of a *judge* in the contest between *Theophilus* and the monks; which greatly exasperated the Alexandrine prelate. The monks of Nitria, having lost their patron, sought a reconciliation with *Theophilus*: but the *Origenist* party still continued to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the neighbouring countries, and Jerusalem became the centre and rendezvous of the sect.(27)

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF CEREMONIES AND RITES.

§ 1. Rites greatly augmented.—§ 2. General Description of them.—§ 3. Love-feasts. Penitence.

§ 1. To recount all the regulations made in this century respecting the mode of worship and religious rites and institutions, would require a volume of considerable size. The curious in these matters are referred to the Acts of the Councils, and to the works of the principal writers of those times. There were some however among these writers, who were not so corrupted by the bad examples of their age, but that they could ingenuously acknowledge true piety to be oppressed by such an enormous mass of ceremonies. This evil originated in part from the degeneracy and indolence of the teachers, in part from the calamities of the times which were unfavourable to mental cultivation, and in part from the innate depravity of man, which disposes him more readily to offer to God the service of his limbs and his eyes, than of his heart.

§ 2. Public worship everywhere assumed a form more calculated for show and for the gratification of the eye. Various ornaments were added to the sacerdotal garments, in order to increase the veneration of the people for the clerical order. The new forms of hymns, prayers, and public fasts, are not easily enumerated. In Gaul particularly, were instituted

(25) See the authors mentioned in the preceding century; to whom add the writers on the Life of Chrysostom, viz., *Tillemont*, *Hermant*, and others: and *Nouveau Dictionnaire historique et crit.*, tome i., 79, 80. [See also note (17), p. 241, above; and *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vi., c. 9-18. *Sozomen*, *H. E.*, lib. viii., c. 13-22.—*Tr.*]

(26) See his three Laws, with the notes of *Gothofred*, in the *Codex Theodosianus*, tom. v., p. 83, 113, &c.

(27) See *Cyrilli Vita Sabae*, in *Cotelier*, *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, tom. ii., p. 274. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. ii., p. 31, &c.

the *Rogations*, or public fasts and supplications, which precede the festal day of *Christ's* ascension.(1) In some places it was appointed, that the praises of God should be sung perpetually, day and night, the singers succeeding each other without interruption ;(2) as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in clamour and noise, and in the flatteries of men. The magnificence of the temples had no bounds.(3) Splendid images were placed in them ; and among these, after the Nestorian contests, the image of the virgin *Mary* holding her infant in her arms, occupied the most conspicuous place. Altars and repositories for relics, made of solid silver if possible, were procured in various places ; from which may easily be conjectured, what must have been the splendour and the expense of the other sacred utensils.

§ 3. On the contrary, the *Agapae* or Love-feasts were abolished ; because, as piety diminished gradually and continually, these feasts gave to many persons occasions for sin.(4) Among the Latins, grievous offenders, who before had to confess their sins in public, were relieved from this unpleasant duty ; for *Leo* the Great gave them liberty to confess their crimes privately to a priest selected for that purpose. In this way the ancient discipline, the sole barrier against shameful and indecent conduct, was removed ; and the actions of men were subjected to the scrutiny of the clergy, which was greatly for their interest.(5)

(1) See *Sidonius Apollinaris*, Epist., lib. v., epist. 16, and lib. vi., epist. 1. *Martene*, *Thesaurus Anecdotor.*, tom. v., p. 47. [The three days immediately preceding Ascension Day, that is, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, it is said, were first observed as days of public fasting, with solemn processions and supplications, by order of *Claudius Mamertus*, bp. of Vienne, in the year 469, upon occasion of a succession of temporal calamities befalling that city. From that diocese, the custom of keeping annually this three days' fast spread over Gaul. The Spanish churches adopted it in the following century ; but they selected for it the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday next after Whitsunday. In Italy, it was not adopted till the close of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century, when *Leo III.* ordained its universal observance, as the appropriate means for securing the blessing of heaven on sinful men. The three days are called *Rogation Days*, and the week *Rogation Week*, and the Sunday preceding *Rogation Sunday*, from the *Rogations* or *Litanies* chanted in the processions on these days. See *Adr. Baillet*, *Vies des Saints et l'Histoire des Festes*, tom. iv., p. 92, &c.—*Tr.*]

(2) *Gervais*, *Histoire de Suger*, tome i., p. 23. [This custom probably originated in the East. There, in the beginning of the fifth century, one *Alexander*, under the auspices of *Gennadius*, the patriarch of Constantinople, established the Order of *Acormetæ* (*ἀκομήτοι*) or the *Sleepless*, who so regulated their worship that it was never in-

terrupted, by day or by night, one class of the brethren succeeding another continually. This order obtained afterwards the name of *Studites*, from a rich Roman counsellor of the name of *Studius*, who went to Constantinople, and erected a cloister appropriately for this order.—*Schl.*]

(3) See an example, in *Zacharias* of Mitylene, de *Opificio Mundi*, p. 165, 166.

(4) [The abolition of the Love-feasts was in part effected in the fourth century. The council of Laodicea (Canon 28), first ordained, that they should no longer be held in the churches. A similar decree was passed in the year 397, by the third council of Carthage, Canon 20, [30]. Yet the custom was too firmly established, to be at once rooted out. Hence we find that in the times of *Augustine*, Love-feasts were still kept in the churches. (*Augustine*, contra *Faus-tum*, l. xx., c. 20, 21. Confess., l. vi., c. 2, and Epist. lxi.) Yet he there informs us, that all kinds of feasting had been excluded from the church of *Ambrose*. In the Gallic churches, Love-feasts were prohibited by the council of Orleans, A.D. 541 ; and, as here and there some relics of them appear in the 7th century, the council in *Trullo* [A.D. 692, Can. 74] was induced to confirm the canon of the Laodicean council, by annexing the penalty of excommunication.—*Schl.*]

(5) [That the strictness of the ancient discipline was greatly relaxed, admits no question. But that all public testimony against particular offenders, all public penances, and public censures, were commuted for *private*

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS SCHISMS AND HERESIES.

§ 1, 2, 3. Old Heresies remaining. The Donatists.—§ 4. State of the Arians.—§ 5. Origin of the Nestorian Sect.—§ 6, 7. The Occasion of it.—§ 8. The Council of Ephesus.—§ 9. Opinion respecting this Controversy.—§ 10. Progress of Nestorianism after this Council.—§ 11, 12. Its Propagator, Barsumas.—§ 13. Eutychian Sect.—§ 14. The Council called *Conventus Latronum*.—§ 15. Council of Chalcedon.—§ 16. Subsequent Contests.—§ 17. In Syria and Armenia.—§ 18. Troubles occasioned by Peter the Fuller. Theopaschites.—§ 19. The *Henoticon* of Zeno.—§ 20. produces new Contests among the Eutychians.—§ 21. and among the Defenders of the Council of Chalcedon.—§ 22. The Doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophysites.—§ 23. The Pelagian Controversy.—§ 24. Its Progress.—§ 25. The Predestinarians.—§ 26. The Semipelagians.—§ 27. Various Controversies concerning Grace.

§ 1. SOME of the earlier sects, acquiring new vigour, dared to disquiet the church. I will pass in silence those inauspicious names of former days, the *Novatians*, the *Marcionites*, and *Manichaeans*, notwithstanding a numerous progeny of them appeared here and there; and will confine my remarks to those two pests of the preceding century, the *Donatists* and the *Arians*.

The *Donatists* had hitherto been prosperous. But near the commencement of this century, the Catholic bishops of Africa, led on principally by *St. Augustine* of Hippo, put forth all their energies to crush and destroy

confession before priests, and for *private* penances, (as *Dr. Mosheim* seems to intimate), is contrary to the voice of history. All *public* offenders, and all such as were *proved* guilty of gross crimes, were still liable to *public* censures. But the ancient practice of *voluntary* confession before the church, of *private* offences and *secret* sins, had for some time gone into desuetude. Instead of such confessions before the church, in most places both of the East and the West, these *voluntary* confessions were made only to a priest, in private; and he directed the persons to such a course as he deemed proper. In some churches however in Campania and the vicinity, the practice was, for the priests to write down these voluntary disclosures, and if the persons were directed to do penance, their confessions were also read in public. It was to correct this *public* disclosure of *voluntary* confessions, that *Leo I.*, in the year 460, wrote the Epistle to the bishops of Campania, Picecum, and Samnium, to which *Dr. Mosheim* refers. See his works, Epist. 130, or in some editions, Ep. 80. It is cited also in *Baronius*, Annales, Ann. 459, sub. finem. The following is a literal translation: "We also decide, that it is every way proper to

rescind the practice so contrary to the apostolic rule, which I learn has been lately followed by some. Let not written statements concerning the nature of the particular sins, be any longer rehearsed in public; since it is sufficient to disclose the accusations of the conscience to the priests, by a private confession. For although that abundance of faith may seem commendable, which, from reverence of God, does not hesitate to take shame before men; yet as the sins of all are not of such a nature that the penitents have no fear to *publish* them, let this censurable practice be abolished; lest many should be kept back from doing penance, because they are either ashamed or afraid to *disclose* their deeds before their enemies, by whom they may be troubled with processes of law. For that confession is sufficient, which is made first to God, and then also to the priest, whose business it is to pray over the sins of the penitent. For then, more persons can be induced to do penance, if the [private] *consciousness* of the confessing person is not published in the ears of the people."—See also *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, *Leo I.*, vol. ii., p. 124, &c., ed. Lond., 1750.—*Tr.*]

this sect ; which was not only very troublesome to the church, but through the *Circumcelliones* who were its soldiers, pernicious also to the commonwealth. Accordingly, in the year 404, the council of Carthage sent deputies to the emperor *Honorius*, petitioning that the imperial laws against heretics might be extended to embrace explicitly the Donatists, who denied that they were *heretics* ; and also that the fury of the *Circumcelliones* might be restrained.(1) The emperor therefore, first imposed a fine upon all *Donatists* who should refuse to return to the church, and ordered their bishops and teachers to be banished.(2) The following year, additional and more severe laws were enacted against the Donatists ; which were usually called (edicta unitatis) *Acts of Uniformity*.(3) And as the magistrates were perhaps somewhat remiss in executing these laws, the council of Carthage in the year 407 sent a new deputation to the emperor, by which they requested and obtained the appointment of special executors of these Acts of Uniformity.(4)

§ 2. The weakened party recovered some strength and courage in the year 408, when *Stilicho* was put to death by order of *Honorius* ;(5) and still more in the year 409, when *Honorius* issued a law that no one should be compelled in matters of religion.(6) But the council of Carthage in the year 410 again sent a deputation to the emperor, and obtained a repeal of this law.(7) and likewise the appointment of *Marcellinus*, a tribune and notary [or imperial secretary], to visit Africa in the year 411, with full power to bring this long and pernicious controversy to a conclusion. Accordingly *Marcellinus*, about the feast of Easter A.D. 411, in that solemn trial which is called a *conference*, formally examined the cause, and after a three days' hearing of the parties, gave sentence in favour of the *Catholics*.(8) Before this court, two hundred and eighty-six Catholic bish-

(1) [The documents of this transaction may be found in *Mansi*, Collectio Concilior. ampliss., tom. iii., p. 1157, and in *Harduin's* Collection, tom. i., in Cod. eccles. African., Can. 92, &c., p. 915, &c., and in *Du Pin*, Monument. vet. ad Donatist. histor. pertinent., p. 216. Compare also *Augustine*, Ep. 93, and among the moderns, Dr. *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iv., p. 192, &c.—*Schl.*]

(2) [Even before the arrival of the deputies from the council, the emperor had determined vigorously to persecute the Donatists, and to compel them to a union with their opposers ; and had issued a law, by which the refractory bishops and clergy were to be banished, and the laity to be fined. The character of this law may be learned from *Augustine*, Epist. 185, § 25, &c., and Epist. 88, § 7. The law itself is probably lost. The edict which was issued after the petition of the council, is in the Codex Theodos., de haeret., l. 38.—*Schl.*]

(3) [These *Edicts of Uniformity* are mentioned in the Codex Theodos., l. 2, de religione ; and in the Decree of the council of Carthage A.D. 407, in Cod. eccles. African., Can. 99, and by *Du Pin*, p. 220. *Gothofred*

and *Tillemont* suppose the before-mentioned laws, (l. 38, de haeret., and l. 3, ne Bapt. iterand), were included among them.—*Schl.*]

(4) [The documents are found in *Du Pin* ; and the laws in the Codex Theodos., l. 41 and 43, de haeret.—*Schl.*]

(5) [See *Augustine*, Ep. 97, § 2, &c., Ep. 100, § 2, Ep. 105, § 6.—*Schl.*]

(6) [This law is in the Codex Theodos., l. 50, de haeret., and in *Du Pin*, Monument., p. 224.—*Schl.*]

(7) [See *Noris*, Historia Donatistor., p. 533.—*Schl.*]

(8) See *Fran. Baldwin*, (who was a lawyer), Historia Collationis Carthag., subjoined to *Opiatus Milevitanus*, ed. *Du Pin*, p. 337. This meeting called by *Marcellinus*, is improperly denominated a *conference* or a free discussion ; for the Donatists and Catholics did not enter into a discussion, and each party endeavour to vanquish the other by arguments. It was truly and properly a *legal trial* ; in which *Marcellinus*, as the judge of this ecclesiastical cause appointed by the emperor, after a three days' hearing of the parties, pronounced sentence authoritatively. It appears therefore, that no one at that time

ops and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist bishops were assembled. The vanquished Donatists appealed indeed to the emperor; but it was in vain. The principal actor in all these scenes was the celebrated *Augustine*; who by his writings, his counsels, and his admonitions, controlled nearly the whole African church and the leading men of the country.(9)

§ 3. By the Conference at Carthage, the Donatist party lost a large part of its strength; nor could it ever recover from the shock, notwithstanding the revolutions in the country. Through fear of punishment, very many submitted to the will of the emperor, and returned to the church. On the contumacious the severest penalties were inflicted, such as fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, and even death upon the more obstinate and seditious.(10) Some escaped these penalties by flight, others by concealing themselves, and some by a voluntary death; for the Donatists were much inclined to practise self-immolation. The *Circumcelliones* escaped by violence and arms, travelling up and down the province, and every where venting their rage. To the Donatists their former liberties and repose were indeed restored by the Vandals, who under *Genseric* their king invaded Africa in the year 427, and wrested this province from the Romans. But the edicts of the emperors had inflicted such a wound on the sect, that though it revived and grew a little under the Vandals, it could never recover the amplitude and strength it formerly possessed.(11)

§ 4. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among those barbarous nations who gradually overturned the Roman empire in the West, and found among the Goths, Heruli, Suevi, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a quiet retreat. Being now safe, they treated the Catholics with the same violence, which the Catholics had employed against them and other heretics, and had no hesitation

once thought of any *supreme judge* in the church appointed by *Christ*. And the bishops of Africa in this case made their application solely to the emperor.—[For an account of this *Conference*, the reader may consult with advantage Dr. *Walch's* *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv., p. 198, &c. As to the sources of knowledge concerning it, see the *Gesta Collationis Carthaginæ habitæ*, published in *Du Pin's Monument. vet. ad hist. Donatist.*, p. 225, &c., and in *Harduin's Collectio Concil.*, tom. i., p. 1043, &c.; also *Augustine. Brevecul. Collationis cum Donatistis*, in his *Opp.*, tom. ix., p. 371, &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) [His writings against the Donatists fill the whole *ninth* volume of his works, according to the Amsterdam impression of the Benedictine edition. His recommendations in the Donatist contest were not always the best. In his *Epistles to Vincentius* and to *Boniface*, he speaks in such a manner about punishing heretics, that he must be regarded as the man whose writings afforded most support to that spirit of persecution, which laid waste the church in after ages more than in his times. In the contest with the Donatists, he seemed often to show himself on

the side of those who would pursue mild measures; for he himself made representations to the imperial court against punishing the Donatists with death. Yet these representations are founded, not on correct views respecting toleration, but on the current principle that it is *unseemly* for Christians to bear a part in the execution of criminals.—*Schl.*]

(10) [By virtue of the law, (*Codex Theodos. de hæreticis*, l. 52), all Donatists without distinction, and even their wives, if they would not unite with the orthodox, were to be fined, according to the wealth of each individual. Such as would not be reclaimed by this means, were to forfeit all their goods; and such as protected them, were liable to the same penalties. Servants and country tenants were to undergo corporeal punishments by their masters and lords, or on the other hand suffer the same pecuniary mulcts. The bishops and all the clergy were to be banished to different places, yet always beyond the province of Africa; and all Donatist churches were transferred to the opposite party.—*Schl.*]

(11) [See *Witsius, Histor. Donatist.*, c. viii., § 9.—*Schl.*]

about persecuting the adherents of the Nicene doctrines in a variety of ways. The Vandals, who had established their kingdom in Africa, surpassed all the rest in cruelty and injustice. At first *Genesius* their king, and then *Huneric* his son, demolished the temples of such Christians as maintained the divinity of the Saviour, sent their bishops into exile, mutilated many of the more firm and decided, and tortured them in various ways.(12) And they expressly stated, that they were authorized to do so by the example of the emperors, who had enacted similar laws against the Donatists in Africa, the Arians, and others who dissented from them in religion.(13) During this African persecution, God himself is said to have confuted the Arians by a great miracle, causing by his Almighty power the persons whose tongues had been cut out by order of the tyrants, to speak distinctly notwithstanding, and to proclaim the glory and the praises of *Christ*. The fact itself no one can well deny, for it rests on powerful testimony; but whether there was anything supernatural in it, may be questioned.(14)

(12) See *Victor Vitensis*, de Persecutione Vandalica, libri iii.; published by *Theod. Ruinart*, in connexion with his own *Historia Persecutionis Vandal.*, Paris, 1694, 8vo, [and reprinted, Venice, 1732.]

(13) See the edict of King *Huneric*, in *Victor Vitensis*, lib. iv., c. ii., p. 64, where much is said on this subject.

(14) See *Ruinart*, *Historia Persecut. Vandal.*, pt. ii., c. 7, p. 482, &c., and the recent and acute discussions of some Englishmen respecting this miracle. *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tome iii., pt. ii., p. 339, &c., tom v., pt. i., p. 171, &c. [Dr. *Mælanne* has here a long note, in review of the discussions respecting this alleged miracle, by *Abbadie*, *Berriman*, *Chapman*, and *Dodwell*, who defend the miracle; and by an anonymous writer, *Middleton*, and *Toll*, who controvert it. The discussion turned on four points, (1) the credibility of the testimony; (2) the degree in which the men were mutilated; (3) the possibility of speaking with imperfect, and even with no tongues; and (4) the probability that God would work a miracle to decide such a theological dispute. — *Schlegel's* note is more historical, and though long, may be worth inserting entire. *Huneric* (he says) in the beginning of his reign was very indulgent to the orthodox, and at the request of the emperor *Zeno*, allowed them to choose a bishop of Carthage, on condition that the Arian churches in the Roman empire should be allowed the same privilege. The orthodox did actually choose *Eugenius* for their bishop. (*Victor Vitensis*, de Persecut. Vandal., lib. ii., cap. 7.) But by the instigation of the Arian bishops, *Huneric* afterwards changed his course. He forbid any person, in a Vandal dress, attending the orthodox worship; and dismissed such of the orthodox as were in his service,

and condemned them to labour in the fields. In the year 483, he banished to the deserts a great number of their teachers, together with their adherents, on pretence of a violation of the royal statutes. In the year 484, in February, a formal conference of both parties was appointed; when the orthodox handed in a long confession of their faith, but without gaining a hearing from the Vandal patriarch *Cyrila*. After this, *Huneric* forbid by a severe law all public worship among the orthodox; ordered their books to be burned; caused the 466 bishops who had been called to Carthage, to be arrested and banished to different countries; and endeavoured to compel all his subjects to become Arians. Many confessors then endured the most distressing sufferings, and a great number of them were cruelly put to death. At *Typasus* in Mauritania, most of the inhabitants fled to Spain, because *Cyrila* determined to force upon them an Arian bishop. Such as stayed behind refused to accept the bishop, and kept up their own separate worship. *Huneric* therefore caused their tongues to be cut out by the roots, and their right hands to be chopped off. They were able, notwithstanding, to speak distinctly. *Victor* expresses himself with so much assurance on this subject, that he says, whoever doubts the fact, need only go to Constantinople, where he will now meet with a subdeacon named *Reparatus*, who, although his tongue was cut out, nevertheless speaks without any effort, clearly, and distinctly, and is on that account in high esteem in the court of the emperor *Zeno*, and especially with the empress. *Eneas* of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher who then lived at Constantinople, and was an eyewitness, (in his *Dialogue on the Resurrection*, entitled *Theophrastus*, p. 81), says he had himself seen these people,

§ 5. A new sect, which was the source of lamentable evils to the church, was produced by *Nestorius*, a Syrian by birth, and bishop of Constantinople. He was a pupil of the celebrated *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, a man of eloquence, and not without learning, but arrogant and indiscreet. That *Christ* was truly God, and at the same time truly man, had been placed beyond all controversy by the decrees of former councils; but as to the *mode* and the *effects* of the union of these two natures in *Christ*, hitherto there had been no discussion among Christians, and nothing had been decided by the councils. The Christian doctors were therefore accustomed to express themselves differently respecting this mystery. Some used expressions, which seemed to separate the Son of God from the Son of man too much, and to make out *two persons* in *Christ*. Others seemed to confound the Son of God with the Son of man, and to make both natures in *Christ* coalesce and constitute *one* compound nature. The Syrian and Oriental doctors differed from those of Alexandria and Egypt, from the time of the rise of the sect of *Apollinaris*, who taught that the man *Christ* was without a proper human soul, and that the divine nature in *Christ* supplied the place of a rational soul; whence it followed that the two natures were commixed. The Syrians therefore, in order to oppose the followers of *Apollinaris*, carefully distinguished the *man* from the *God* in *Christ*, and used phraseology which might lead to the supposition, that they divided the person of *Christ* into *two persons*. On the contrary, the Alexandrians and the Egyptians were accustomed to adopt modes of expression, which might be charged with favouring Apollinarism, and which seemed to imply a confusion of the two natures. *Nestorius* being bred in the Syrian schools, and extremely anxious for the extermination of all the sects and especially that of the Apollinarists, discoursed of the two natures in *Christ* after the manner of his instructors, and directed his hearers to make a distinction between the Son of God and the Son of man, and carefully to discriminate the actions and sensations of the one from those of the other. (15)

and had heard them, to his amazement, speak distinctly; that he would not trust his ears, but ascertained the fact by ocular proof; that he made them open their mouths, and then found that their tongues were cut out at the roots. *Procopius* testifies, that many of those whose tongues had been cut out, were living at Constantinople in his times, and that they spoke very distinctly. The count *Marcellinus*, who was chancellor to *Justinian*, and compiled his Chronicle from the records of the judicial courts, says: Se vidisse mutum quendam, ita natum, post abscissam linguam statim locutum, refutasse Arianorum haeresin et de fide Christiana veras voces emisisse. *Isidorus*, in his Chronicle, testifies also to the fact; as does *Evagrius*, in his Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., c. 4. See *Valesius* on these passages; and *Sagittarius*, de Cruciat. Martyr., p. 296, and *Joh. And. Schmidt*, Diss. de elinguis mysterium Trinitatis praedicantibus; in his Decas Dissert. hist. theol., No. 7. Even *Justinian* himself, (Codex Justin., lib. i., tit. 27,

de officio praefecti praetorio Africae), says: "We have seen venerable men, with their tongues cut out from the roots, lamentably describing their sufferings." One must therefore carry historical skepticism quite too far, if he would question the reality of the fact. But whether it be not possible, that a man should speak distinctly without a tongue, and also whether that which took place in Africa during this persecution was a real miracle, or not, are more properly physical than historical questions.—*Tr*]

(15) A *History of Nestorianism* was written in French, by the Jesuit, *Lewis Doucin*, Paris, 1716, 4to. But it is such a one as might be expected from a person who was obliged to rank *Cyril* among the saints, and *Nestorius* among the heretics. [A better account is given by *C. W. F. Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., p. 289, &c., to the end of the volume.] The ancient writers on both sides are mentioned by *J. F. Buddeus*, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii., p. 1084, &c. In what manner the

§ 6. The occasion for this controversy was given by *Anastasius*, a presbyter and the intimate friend of *Nestorius*. In a public discourse delivered A.D. 428, *Anastasius* opposed the use of the word *θεοτοκος*, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently applied to the mother of *Christ* in discussions with the Arians than formerly, and to which the Apollinarists were exceedingly attached; alleging that the Holy Virgin could only be called *χριστοτόκος*, *mother of Christ*, because *God* could neither be born nor die, so that only the *Son of man* was born of *Mary*. *Nestorius* approved this discourse of his friend, and in several addresses explained and defended it. (16) Some monks at Constantinople made opposition, maintaining that the *son of Mary* was *God incarnate*, and they excited the populace against *Nestorius*. But most persons were pleased with his discourses; and when they were carried to the monks of Egypt, these were so moved by his arguments that they embraced his opinions and ceased to denominate *Mary* the *mother of God*. (17)

§ 7. *Cyril*, a man of a most restless and arrogant spirit, was then bishop of Alexandria, and of course jealous of the increasing power and authority of the Constantinopolitan prelate. On hearing of this controversy, he first reprimanded both the monks and *Nestorius*. But as the latter would not retract, after advising with *Cælestine* the bishop of Rome, *Cyril* resolved on war; and calling a council at Alexandria A.D. 430, he hurled twelve *anathemas* at the head of *Nestorius*, who finding himself accused of blasphemy against *Christ*, returned as many *anathemas* against *Cyril*, accusing him of the same crime, and of Apollinarianism, and of confounding the two natures of *Christ*. (18) This contest between two bish-

Oriental writers relate the matter, is stated by *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.*, p. 108, and by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. lxxvii., &c. [For the sources of knowledge, and a list of the writers on this controversy, see *Walch*, loc. cit., p. 304, &c. See also *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xviii., p. 183, &c. *Münchler*, *Dogmengesch.*, vol. iv., p. 53-78. *Gieseler's* Text-book, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 228-237.—For testimony to the persecuting spirit of *Nestorius*, see *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vii., c. 29, &c., where we are told, that on the very day of his installation, he thus publicly addressed the emperor: "Give me a country purged of heretics, and I will recompense you with heaven; aid me to conquer the heretics, and I will aid you to conquer the Persians." And five days after, he commenced his work, by demolishing the *Arian* house of worship, and proceeded to persecute the *Novatians*, the *Quartodecimani*, and the *Macedonians*. He was undoubtedly a rash zealot; yet a person of some talents, sincere, and by no means inclined to be a heresiarch. See a general account of him, in note (31), p. 333, &c., above.—*Tr.*]

(16) See these discourses of *Nestorius*, in the works of *Marius Mercator*, tom. ii.,

p. 5. &c., accompanied with the observations of *Joh. Garnier*. [See also *Socrates*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. vii., c. 32.—*Tr.*]

(17) [*Cyril*, against *Nestorius*, lib. i., and in his Epistles to the monks, to *Nestorius*, and to *Cælestine*.—*Schl.*]

(18) See *Joh. Harduin*, *Concilia*, tom. i., p. 2199. Other *anathemas* against *Nestorius*, different from the published ones, are set forth by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. iii., part ii., p. 199, &c.—[A more circumstantial account of the events touched on in this section, drawn from *Dr. Walch*, is contained in the following note of *Von Einem*. The Epistle of *Cyril* to the Egyptian monks was brought to Constantinople, and it justly gave offence to *Nestorius* and his friends; for *Cyril* might at least have sought a friendly correspondence with *Nestorius*. The epistle was refuted by *Nestorius*. *Cyril* then wrote to *Nestorius*; who answered him shortly, and gave him to understand, that he had as little inclination for a controversy, as to have *Cyril* for a judge in this matter. *Dorotheus* bishop of Marcanople, was so indiscreet as to anathematize publicly in the church the doctrine that *Mary* was the *mother of God*; and this inflamed *Cyril* the more, as he supposed that the opposite party meant to anathematize him. In the mean time, some Alexandrians

ops of the highest order, and originating rather from the depraved passions of the mind than from a sincere love of truth, was the parent and the cause of immense evils.

§ 8. The feelings of the parties being so exasperated by their reciprocal excommunications and letters that there was no prospect of an amicable termination of the controversy, the emperor *Theodosius II.* assembled a council at Ephesus in the year 431, which is accounted the *third general council*. *Cyril*, the adversary of *Nestorius*, presided; and he wished to have the cause examined and decided, before *John* the bishop of Antioch and the other bishops of the East should arrive. *Nestorius* maintained, that both circumstances were contrary to equity; and therefore, when summoned to trial, he refused to appear. But *Cyril*, pressing the business forward, without a hearing of the cause, and a great part of the bishops being absent, *Nestorius*, whom the council compare with *Judas* the betrayer of the Saviour, was condemned as guilty of blasphemy, deprived of his office, and sent into banishment, where he closed his days. (19) That

at Constantinople accused *Cyril* of various offences, the nature and grounds of which are not known. *Cyril* therefore became suspicious of *Nestorius*; and conducted towards him in an offensive manner. Both prelates now wrote to each other, using severe language. *Cyril* also sent prolix statements to the emperor, and to the princesses *Pulcheria*, *Arcadia*, and *Marinia*: which thing however was not relished by the emperor, who supposed *Cyril* aimed to produce disagreement in the emperor's family. The contest now reached *Cælestine*, bishop of Rome. *Nestorius* wrote to him first, and although on another matter, yet he gave him incidentally an account of the disturbances at Constantinople, but without even mentioning *Cyril*. He also sent his discourses. But as *Cælestine* did not understand Greek, (a poor commendation of a bishop of Rome!) the discourses were laid by unread, and the letter was not answered. *Nestorius* repeated his letters, but without mentioning *Cyril*, or attempting to prejudice *Cælestine* against him. *Cyril* however, fearing such a thing, sent *Possidonius* to Rome, with the writings of *Nestorius*, and his correspondence with him translated into Latin; and invited *Cælestine* to join him against *Nestorius*. *Cælestine* acknowledges, that his first acquaintance with the heresy of *Nestorius* was derived from the statement of *Cyril*. He held a council at Rome, and made a decree that *Nestorius* should be deposed, unless he recanted within ten days after receiving his letter. Besides the letters to *Nestorius* and *Cyril*, (to the latter of whom he committed the execution of his decree), he sent a letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and a circular letter to the other patriarchs and bishops. *Cyril* forwarded the circular, accompanying it with additional let-

ters; but the letter to the chief men of Constantinople he kept back. *John* bishop of Antioch, sent the letter he received from *Cyril* to *Nestorius*; and accompanied it with such observations as were an honour to him, and which made such an impression on *Nestorius* that he explained himself well in public discourses, merely rejecting the erroneous meaning of the phrase, *mother of God*. Whether *Cyril* was made acquainted with this change in the circumstances of the case, is not known. He now called a council at Alexandria, in which a letter was drawn up addressed to *Nestorius*, and also twelve condemnatory propositions for him to subscribe as the formula of his retraction. A letter was also directed to the officers and members of the church at Constantinople, exhorting them to rise against their patriarch. A third letter was addressed to the monks. Four bishops were appointed to deliver to *Nestorius* the letter of the council, and also the still retained letter of *Cælestine* to him. *Nestorius* did not speak with these delegated bishops, nor comply with the demands of the letters; but his public discourses became more embittered. The retaliatory anathemas which he now published, were undoubtedly designed to bring *Cyril* under suspicion as holding erroneous opinions concerning the person of *Christ*. *John* of Antioch, and many Oriental bishops with him, actually judged the propositions of *Cyril* to be erroneous. *Nestorius*, on the contrary, was declared by *John* to have explained himself in an orthodox manner. In the mean time *Nestorius* was proceeding with zeal, and excommunicated many persons.—See *Dr. Walch's Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., p. 700, &c.—*Von Ein.*]

(19) Concerning this council, the principal work to be consulted is the *Variorum Pa-*

base artifices and dispositions were very operative in this council, and that *Cyrl* was influenced more by his passions than by justice and piety, no

trum Epistolæ ad concilium Ephesinum pertinentes, which *Chr. Lupus* published from MSS. at Cassino and in the Vatican, *Louvain*, 1682, 4to. *Nestorius* was first transported to Petra in Arabia, then to Oasis, a desert place in Egypt, where he probably died in the year 435, [or rather, after A.D. 439.] The accounts of his lamentable death, given by *Eragrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. i., c. 7, and by *Theodorus Lector*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., p. 565, are undoubtedly fables deserving no credit.—[On the council of Ephesus, see *Dr. Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversamml., p. 275, &c., and Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. v., p. 452, &c.; from which the following account is taken.—The emperor called the council; *Nestorius* was one of the first that arrived. With him came two imperial ministers of state, one of whom was accompanied by soldiers to protect the council, and was commanded by the emperor to remain with the council. *Cyrl* of Alexandria appeared also, attended by a number of Egyptian bishops, who, with *Memnon* bishop of Ephesus, were of his party. From the western provinces appeared only three deputies from the see of Rome, and one deacon deputed by the bishop of Carthage. *Cyrl* presided, though a party. *Nestorius* with the imperial commissioners, made the reasonable request that the opening of the council might be deferred till the arrival of *John* of Antioch and the other eastern bishops, and also of the Italian and Sicilian members. But neither prayers nor tears, nor commands in the name of the emperor, could move the fiery *Cyrl* to delay; although it was affirmed that *John* and the other eastern bishops were within five days' travel of Ephesus. The council was opened June 22. The imperial commissioner gave his public protest against the proceeding, and then retired. *Nestorius* was cited three times to appear; but he refused to stand before a court thus illegally sitting, and from which he had so little reason to expect justice. He was therefore on the same day, pronounced a heretic by an irregular outcry. The condemnation was not founded on the Holy Scriptures, but on the writings of the fathers. The next day, the decision was communicated to *Nestorius*; and an account of it was sent to Constantinople, with a letter recommending the immediate choice of a new bishop. *Candidianus* the imperial commissioner, and *Nestorius* transmitted an account of the whole procedure to the emperor; and the former endeavoured, though in vain, to arrest the irregular pro-

ceedings at Ephesus. The arrival of *John* and the eastern bishops on the 27th of June, made the state of things worse rather than better. They were offended with the council for not waiting for their arrival; and they united themselves with a considerable part of the council, who opposed the violent measures against *Nestorius*, and who accused *Cyrl* of many errors. Whether the two parties had afterwards any communication with each other is uncertain. *John* presided over the dissenting party, who met in the house where he lodged, and who in their precipitancy declared *Cyrl* and *Memnon* to be deposed, and to be banished. From this time there were two councils sitting at Ephesus, the one under *Cyrl* and the other under *John*, as the presidents. The latter was supported by the imperial commissioner. But both committed such extravagances, as show that the spirit of meekness did not rest upon these fathers. These intemperate proceedings threatened to kindle a flame in the church, and even to disturb the public peace. The emperor therefore thought it necessary to bring the matter before his court, and to proceed rather upon principles of good policy than of strict justice. He confirmed the decisions of both parties against each other, in regard to *Nestorius*, *Cyrl*, and *Memnon*; and sent another of his ministers to Ephesus, to expel these three bishops from the city, and to admonish the others to unite and act together. In the mean time the bishops of *Cyrl's* party had held no less than six sessions; in the three first of which, the arrival and formal accession of the delegates from Rome to all the proceedings of *Cyrl* against *Nestorius*, and the making out an account of these proceedings to be sent to the emperor, were the principal transactions. The three subsequent sessions tended farther to widen the breach, as the eastern bishops were publicly excommunicated by the party of *Cyrl*, and a new confession of faith was framed by them. The imperial minister now arrived, and put *Cyrl* and *Memnon* under arrest; but he laboured in vain to unite the fiercely contending parties. Both concluded to send their respective deputies to the court, which was then at Chalcedon. Historians tell us, that the court people were friendly to *Nestorius*. If so, it will be difficult to assign the cause of the unexpected revocation by the emperor of his former decree which deprived *Cyrl* and *Memnon* of their offices, while he still condemned *Nestorius* to banishment. The party of *Cyrl*, indeed, when they found things not proceed-

wise and good man will readily deny; but the doctrine established by the council, that *Christ* consists of *one divine person*, yet of *two natures* most closely *united*, but *not mixed and confounded*, has been approved and acknowledged by the great body of Christians.

§ 9. To pass by the minor errors which were attributed to *Nestorius*, he is said to have divided *Christ* into two persons, and to have held that the divine nature joined itself to the full formed man, and only *aided* him during his life. But *Nestorius* himself, as long as he lived, professed himself utterly opposed to such sentiments. (20) Nor were such sentiments ever directly stated by him, but only inferred by his adversaries from his rejection of the epithet *mother of God*, and from some incautious and ambiguous terms which he used. Hence, very many both among the ancients and the moderns think, that he held the same sentiments that the Ephesine fathers did, though he expressed himself in a different manner; and they cast the whole blame of this most destructive contest upon the restless spirit of *Cyril*, and his malignant disposition towards *Nestorius*. (21) Al-

ing according to their wishes at Ephesus, made every effort to meet the investigation of the case before the imperial court. And their movements were not unsuccessful. The outcry of the more worthless clergy and the monks against *Nestorius*, may have made considerable impression, producing fear of an insurrection if *Cyril* were punished. Besides, *Nestorius* fell under the displeasure of *Pulcheria*, the emperor's sister, who had vast influence over him. And *Cyril* co-operated by means,—always very efficacious in courts,—the bribery of the ministers. It is strange, that the subsequent ages should have regarded the Ephesine assembly as ranking among councils of the highest order; since in regard to the principal points, it decided nothing happily, and what *was* done was in reality done by the emperor.—*Schlegel's* abridgment of *Walch*, corrected by the original.—*Tr.*]

(20) See *Marius Mercator*, Opp., tom. ii., p. 286, ed. *Garnier*: and Fragments of the Epistles of *Nestorius*, written a little before his death; in *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican., tom. ii., p. 40, 41.

(21) Among the moderns, *Luther* first held such sentiments, and inveighed bitterly against *Cyril*: de Conciliis, in his Opp., tom. vii., ed. Altenb., p. 265, 266, 273, &c. He was followed by innumerable others; as *Peter Bayle*, Dictionnaire, tom. iii., [and iv.,] artic. *Nestorius* and *Rodon*: *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Eutychemismo ante Eutychem, p. 200: *Otto Fred. Schütz*, de Vita Chytraei, lib. ii., § 29, p. 190, 191: *Jo. Voigt*, Biblioth. Historiæ Haeresial., tom. i., pt. iii., p. 457: *Paul. Fran. Jablonsky*, Exercit. de Nestorianismo, Berlin, 1720, 8vo: Thesaurus Epistolicus Crozianus, tom. i., p. 184, &c., tom. iii., p. 175: *Jordan*, Vie de Mr. la Croze, p. 231, and many others. What may

be alleged against *Nestorius*, is carefully collected by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 210, &c. [*C. W. F. Walch*, (Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. v., p. 778, &c.), after a careful investigation, states the sentiments of *Nestorius* in the following propositions. (1) The doctrine of three persons in the one divine essence, as stated in the Nicene Creed, is true and certain. (2) In particular, the second Person the divine Word, is true God, eternally begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with him. (3) Yet *Christ* is not only true God, but likewise a complete man; that is, he had a body and a rational soul, just as we have. (4) His body he derived from the virgin *Mary*, and in her womb. (5) Nothing therefore is more certain than, that *Christ* possessed *two natures*, a divine and a human. (6) Yet there are not, on this account, *two persons*, two Sons, two Christs, two Lords; but he is *one person*, one Christ, one Son, one Lord. (7) There was therefore a union between the perfect God the Word, and the perfect man; and this union may be expressed by various terms, among which *συνάφεια* [*connexion*] is the best, but *ένωσις* [*union*] is not to be rejected. (8) To the question, *What was united?* *Nestorius* answered, *God and man*, the divinity and humanity, the *two natures*, or *two substances* and *hypostasies*; but not *two persons*. (9) This union did not consist in this, that the natures ceased to possess their peculiar properties; for the essential difference of the two natures remained, without the least change or communion. (10) Yet the union was inseparable, so that the Word was never afterwards without the assumed man, nor the man without the Word. (11) The union of the two natures commenced with the existence

lowing these to judge correctly, still *Nestorius* must be pronounced guilty of two faults : first, that he was disposed rashly, and with offence to many,

of the human nature, when he was conceived in the womb of his mother. (12) It is therefore correctly said, the *Word* became man and was made flesh. (13) It is also correctly said, the Son of God took upon him man. (14) It is easy to state what kind of union *Nestorius* did not admit ; but it cannot be proved, that he distinctly believed as bishop *John* states. (15) To explain the connexion of the two natures of *Christ* as united in one person, *Nestorius* said : The Son of God *dwells* in the man ; and the flesh is the *temple* of God. Yet he explained himself by saying, that he did not understand *such an indwelling*, as the indwelling of God in the faithful and in the prophets. (16) *Nestorius* called the human nature *an instrument*, by which the Son of God worked ; and *a garment*, with which he was clad ; and said, God *carried and bare* the man. (17) He also admitted a *communion or intercourse* of the two natures. (18) And at the same time, held to the so called *personal properties*. (19) In respect to the *communication* of attributes, *Nestorius* held that in the scriptures, names are used in reference to our Saviour, which indicate the *union of the two* natures, but not one nature as *distinct* from the other : names, with which we must connect the idea of the *entire Christ* ; e. g., *Immanuel, Christ, Jesus, Son, Only Begotten, Lord*. (20) *Nestorius* admitted that the scriptures attribute to *Christ* both divine and human attributes and acts. And he states this rule for interpreting them : Every attribute and act which the scriptures ascribe to *Christ*, must be understood indeed of the *one person*, yet not of *both his natures* ; but the sublime and God-befitting must be referred to the *divine* nature, and the inferior to the *human* nature. (21) In the writings of *Nestorius*, noticeable passages occur relating to the expressions which denote the *participation or communication* of attributes, and which are indicative of his real sentiments on the subject. They may be divided into two classes. To the first class belong the expressions, by which the properties and changes of the *human* nature are referred to *Christ* in his *divine* nature, or (according to the customary phraseology of those times) to the *Word* that was God. The first expression is that of *being born*. It is undeniable that *Nestorius* (though not likewise his friends, a few only excepted) rejected the use of the term *mother of God* ; as also the expression, *Mary bore the Deity*, or *what was born of Mary, was God*. Yet it is equally undeniable, that *Nestorius* did not reject the

term *mother of God*, nor indeed the other expressions, *utterly and perseccringly*, except under the limitation of, *being so and so understood* ; otherwise he acknowledged and professed the correctness and harmlessness of them. (22) The next expression is, *the sufferings, the death, and burial of Christ*. *Nestorius* did not deny that it was *God*, or *man in union with God*, i. e., *one Christ*, that was crucified, suffered, died, and was buried. But he did deny that *Christ*, in so far as he was *God*, was the subject of these changes ; because he was, in his divine nature, unchangeable, and incapable of suffering and dying. (23) The third expression is *resurrection*. On this, his views were the same as on the preceding. As he had borrowed the word *temple* from *John ii., 19, &c.*, he insisted that *Christ* there distinguishes the temple from him who raises it up. Yet this distinction he would understand to imply, not a *division of persons*, but only a *difference of natures*. (24) To the second class belong such as relate to the doctrine of a communication of the properties of the *divine* nature to the *human*. And here *Nestorius* did not deny that the *man Christ* possessed *divine* properties ; but only that he possessed them of *himself*, or not by virtue of the union. (25) He conceded, that to *Christ* as to his human nature, the divine names and titles were pertinent ; but with the limitation again, *not of himself*, but *on account of the union*. (26) He admitted, that to the *man Christ* divine worship belonged ; but again, *not for his own sake*, but on account of the union. (27) The species of communication of attributes, which our theologians call *apotelesmatic*, (attributing the *mediatorial acts* of the Redeemer in his *official capacity*, either to the complex person, or to either of his natures indiscriminately), *Nestorius* fully recognised : and it is not true, that he regarded the work of *redemption* as the work solely of the *human* nature. (28) Hence it follows, that *Nestorius* understood well, and expressed distinctly, the *unity of the person* of *Christ*, and also the *diversity and union of the two natures*, with its consequences ; yet that he was always anxious for excluding the use of such expressions, as obscured and rendered undiscernible the *distinction* of the two natures. Hence, when he spoke of *Christ*, he preferred using a name expressive of his complex person. Thus he would rather say *χριστοῦκος*, *mother of Christ*, than say *θεοτόκος*, *mother of God* ; or if the latter could not be avoided, he would add something to qualify

to abolish the use of a harmless term(22) which had been long current; and secondly, that he presumed to express and explain by unsuitable phrases and comparisons a mystery which exceeds all human comprehension. If to these faults be added the excessive vanity and impetuosity of the man, it will be difficult to determine which was the principal cause of this great contest, *Cyrl* or *Nestorius*.

§ 10. The council of Ephesus was so far from putting an end to these contentions, that it rather extinguished all hope of the restoration of harmony. *John* bishop of Antioch, and the other eastern prelates, whose arrival *Cyrl* would not wait for, assembled at Ephesus; and they issued as severe a sentence against *Cyrl*, and his friend *Meumon* bishop of Ephesus, as they had issued against *Nestorius*. Hence a violent and troublesome controversy arose between *Cyrl* and the Oriental bishops who had *John* of Antioch for their leader. It was indeed partially adjusted in the year 433, when *Cyrl* acceded to a formula of faith prescribed by *John*, and rejected the use of certain suspicious phrases. Yet the commotions it produced continued long in the East.(23) And no means could prevent the friends and disciples of *Nestorius* from spreading his doctrines through various provinces of the East, and every where gathering churches which rejected the Ephesine decrees.(24) The Persians in particular were averse from any reconciliation with *Cyrl*, and persevered in maintaining, that *Nestorius* was rashly condemned at Ephesus, and that *Cyrl* subverted the distinction between the two natures of *Christ*. The propagation of the Nestorian doctrines was still more successful, after the introduction of those doctrines into the celebrated Persian school which had for some time flourished at Edessa. For the teachers in this school not only taught Nestorian principles to their pupils, but likewise translated from Greek into Syriac the writings of *Nestorius* and his master *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, as well as of *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and spread them throughout Assyria and Persia.(25)

§ 11. To no one of all its patrons is the Nestorian doctrine more indebted than to *Barsumas*. Ejected from the school of Edessa with his associates, and in the year 435 created bishop of Nisibis, he laboured from the year 440 to the year 485 with incredible assiduity and dexterity, to procure for Nestorianism a permanent establishment in Persia. *Maanes*, bishop of Ardaschir, was his principal coadjutor. His measures were so

it, as *mother of the God-Man*.—*Dr. Walch* is one who thinks the whole controversy between *Nestorius* and his accusers was a mere dispute about words and phrases. But *Dr. Hofmann*, in a dispute at Wittemberg, A.D. 1725, maintained, that *the Nestorian controversy was not a mere logomachy*.—*Schl*]

(22) ["The title *mother of God*, applied to the virgin *Mary*, is not perhaps so innocent as *Dr. Mosheim* takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can present no idea at all, and to the ignorant and unwary it may present the most absurd and monstrous notions. The invention and use of such mysterious terms as have no place in scripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion."—*Macl.*]

(23) See *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Euty-chianismo ante Eutythen, p. 243, &c., [and *Dr. Walch's Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., p. 619. &c.—*Schl.*]

(24) [The Roman provinces, in which Nestorianism most prevailed, were the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Moesia, Thessaly, Isauria, and the second Cappadocia.—*Tr.*]

(25) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican., tom. i., p. 351, &c., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 69. From which, with other passages, we should correct the account of the early history of Nestorianism, given by *Eus. Renaudot*, (*Liturgiarum Oriental.*, tom. ii., p. 99, &c.), and by others. See also *Theodorus Lector*, *Hist. Eceles.*, lib. ii., p. 558.

successful, that all the Nestorians in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the neighbouring countries, deservedly venerate him only to this day as their parent and founder. He persuaded the Persian monarch *Pherozes*, to expel the Christians who adhered to the opinions of the Greek fathers, and not only to admit Nestorians in their place, but to allow them to make the first cities in Persia, Seleucia and Ctesiphon, their primary seat; which their *patriarch* or *Catholic* has occupied quite to our times. He also erected the famous school at *Nisibis*, from which issued those who in this and the following century carried the Nestorian doctrines into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and even to China. (26)

§ 12. Before this sect became fully formed and established, there was some difference of opinion in it. Some said, that the manner in which the two natures in *Christ* were combined, was wholly unknown; and some denied any other connexion than that of will, operation, and dignity. (27) But this disagreement wholly disappeared, from the time that the Nestorian

(26) All these transactions are well illustrated, by the before-mentioned *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 77, &c. [The *Nestorians* are not called by this name in the East, for they regard their doctrines as apostolic, and they never had any connexion with the person of *Nestorius*; but are generally called *Chaldaic Christians*, because their principal or head church is in the ancient Chaldea; and in some part of the East Indies, *St. Thomas Christians*, because they suppose they received Christianity from the apostle *Thomas*.—They constitute a large Christian community, which has no connexion with others; have their own forms of worship, their own bishops, and their own ecclesiastical councils. Their church extends through all Asia, and exists partly in the Persian, partly in the Turkish, and partly in the Mogul empires. The patriarch resides in a monastery not far from Mosul, and has a great many bishops under him. The enmity of the Persians, and afterwards of the Mohammedans and Saracens against the Romans, contributed much to further the spread of this sect; for they received all refugees from the Roman empire, and extended full protection to such Christians as were not tolerated in the Roman provinces, and whom of course they could not suspect of any understanding with the Romans. *Ibas* bishop of Edessa, was one of the greatest defenders of *Nestorius* among the Orientals; and on that account, his epistle to *Marin* the Persian bishop of Ardaschir, was rejected by some councils. But the chief persons among them were *Barsumas* and his assistant *Maanes*. After the death of *Barsumas*, the archbishop of Seleucia, *Babacus*, became the head of the party; and from this time onward, the patriarchs (*catholici* or *jacelich*) resided at *Se-*

leucia, until, under the califs, *Bagdat* and *Mosul* were selected for that purpose. This *Babacus* held a council in the year 499, in which not only the whole Persian church professed itself to belong to the Nestorian community, but regulations were also made that all bishops and priests must be married, and second marriages of the clergy were not merely permitted but declared to be necessary. (See *Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 177.) The *Nestorians* differ from other Christians in the following particulars: that they will not call *Mary* the *mother of God*; and wholly reject the expressions, *God was crucified and died*; that they admit no *natural and personal*, but only a *friendly union* of the *Word that was God* (for so they speak) with the *man Jesus*; that they teach, there are in *Christ* two natures and two substances, each of which has its own personality: that they reject the council of Ephesus; execrate *Cyril*, as being a wicked wretch; and venerate *Nestorius* and *Theodorus* of Mopsnestia, as being saints: that they worship no images; and perform their worship, which is very simple, in the Syriac language. Together with *baptism*, which they generally administer on the 40th day after the birth, and the *Lord's supper*, in which they use leavened bread, they make the *consecration of priests* to be a *sacrament*. They also practise anointing with oil, as a ceremony of worship, and likewise in slight diseases, and even in commencing journeys, as a sort of consecration. See *Baumgarten's* Geschichte der Religionspartheyen, p. 586.—*Schl.*]

(27) *Leontius* Byzantinus, adv. Nestorianos et Eutychianos; in *Hon. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquar., tom. i., 537, and *Jo. Basnag*, Prolegom. ad Canisium, tom. i., cap. ii., p. 19, &c.

community became duly consolidated. For it was decreed by synods assembled at Seleucia, that there were in the Saviour of mankind *two persons* or *ὑποστάσεις*, namely a *divine* that of the *Word*, and a *human* that of *Jesus*; yet that both persons constituted but one *Aspect*, or as they (following *Nestorius*) expressed it, one *Barsopa*, that is, *πρόσωπον*: that this union of the Son of God with the Son of man, took place at the moment of conception, and would never end: but that it was not a union of natures or persons, but only of will and affection; *Christ* therefore, must be carefully distinguished from God, who (in the language of *Nestorius*) dwelt in *Christ* as in his temple; and that *Mary* should never be called the *mother of God*, but only the *mother of Christ*. They reverence *Nestorius* as a holy man, and worthy of everlasting remembrance; but they maintain that his doctrine was much more ancient than he, being derived from the earliest ages of the church; and therefore they wish not to be called *Nestorians*. And it appears in fact, that *Barsumas* and his associates did not inculcate on their followers precisely the doctrines taught by *Nestorius*; but they in some measure polished his imperfect system, enlarged it, and connected with it other doctrines which *Nestorius* never embraced.

§ 13. While avoiding the fault of *Nestorius*, many ran into the opposite extreme. The most noted of these was *Eutyches*, abbot of a certain convent of monks at Constantinople; from whom originated another sect, directly opposite to that of *Nestorius*, but equally troublesome and mischievous to the interests of Christianity, and which like that spread with great rapidity throughout the East, and acquired such strength in its progress that it gave immense trouble both to the Nestorians and to the Greeks, and became a great and powerful community. In the year 448, *Eutyches*, now far advanced in years, in order more effectually to put down *Nestorius* to whom he was a violent foe, explained the doctrine concerning the person of *Christ* in the phraseology of the Egyptians, maintaining that there was *only one nature in Christ*, namely, that of the *Word who became incarnate*.(28) Hence he was supposed to deny the *humanity* of *Jesus*

(28) That *Cyril* had so expressed himself, and had appealed to the authority of *Athanasius* to justify the phraseology, is beyond controversy. But whether *Athanasius* actually used such language, is doubtful; for many think the book in which it occurs was not a production of *Athanasius*. See *Mich. le Quien*, Diss. ii. in *Damascenum*, p. 31, &c., and *Christ. Aug. Salig*, de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem, p. 112, &c. That the Syrians used the same phraseology, before *Eutyches'* times, and without offence, is shown by *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. i., p. 219.—We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the *Eutychnian* troubles; which however, *Christ. Aug. Salig* left in manuscript. [This has not yet been published; but *Dr. Ch. W. Fr. Walch* has given a very elaborate and full history of the Eutychnian and Monophysite sects, filling the whole 6th, 7th, and 8th volumes of his *Historie der Ketzeren*, Lips., 1773, 76–78, 8vo, and *M.*

Schroecckh has treated the subject well in his *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xviii., p. 433–636, Lips., 1793, 8vo. See also *Muensch*, Dogmengesch., vol. iv., p. 79–122; *Gieseler's* Text-book, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 237, &c., 315, &c. The points in controversy between *Eutyches* and his friends on the one part, and their antagonists on the other, during the first period of the contest or till the council of Chalcedon in 451, according to *Dr. Walch*, (loc. cit., vol. vi., p. 611–619), were in amount, as follows. Both held alike, (1) the perfect correctness of the Nicene Creed. And of course, (2) both held the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; (3) that God the Word was made flesh; (4) that *Christ* was truly God and truly man united; and (5) that, after the union of the two natures he was *one person*. But *Eutyches* maintained, (6) that the two natures of *Christ* after the union, did not remain *two distinct* natures, but constituted *one nature*; and therefore, (7) that

Christ; and was accused by *Eusebius* of Doryleum, before a council called by *Flavianus*, perhaps in this very year, at Constantinople. And as *Eutyches* refused to give up his opinions at the bidding of this council, he was cast out of the church and deprived of his office; and he not acquiescing in this decree, appealed to a general council of the whole church. (29)

§ 14. The emperor *Theodosius* therefore, in the year 449, convoked at Ephesus such a council as *Eutyches* had requested, and placed at the head of it *Dioscorus* bishop of Alexandria, a man as ambitious and restless as *Cyril*, and as hostile to the bishop of Constantinople. In this council the business was conducted with the same kind of fairness and justness, as by *Cyril* in the council of Ephesus against *Nestorius*. For *Dioscorus*, in whose church nearly the same things were taught as *Eutyches* had advanced, so artfully managed and controlled the whole of the proceedings, that the doctrine of *one nature incarnate* was triumphant, and *Eutyches* was acquitted of all error. On the contrary, *Flavianus* was severely scourged, and banished to Epipa, a city of Lydia, where he soon after died. (30) The Greeks call this Ephesine council, *σύνδοκον ληστρικὴν*, an *Assembly of Robbers*, to signify that everything was carried in it by fraud and violence. Yet this name would be equally applicable to many councils of this and the subsequent times.

§ 15. But the scene changed soon after. *Flavianus* and his adherents engaged *Leo* the Great, the Roman pontiff, on their side,—a course which was commonly taken in that age, by those who were foiled by their ene-

it was correct to say, *Christ* was constituted of or from two natures; but not that he existed in two natures. For (8) the union of the two natures was such that, although neither of them was lost or was essentially changed, yet together they constituted *one nature*; of which compound nature, and not of either of the original natures alone, must thenceforth be predicated each and every property of both natures. He accordingly denied, (9) that it is correct to say of *Christ*, that as to his human nature he was *ὁμοῦς* (*of the same nature*) with us. It is to be remembered, that *Eutyches* was solicitous chiefly to confute *Nestorius*, (who kept the two natures almost entirely distinct, and seemed to deny any other union than that of *purpose* and *co-operation*, and who in particular disliked all phrases which predicated the acts and sufferings of the *human nature*, of the *divine nature*); and to enable him to overturn this error, *Eutyches* so blended the two natures, that they could not afterwards be distinguished.—*Tr.*]

(29) [This was an occasional council, assembled for other purposes, before which *Eusebius* appeared and accused *Eutyches*. The council peremptorily required him to give up his opinions; and on his refusal, proceeded at once to excommunicate him. See the Acts of this council, in *Harduin's Coll.*, tom. ii., p. 70, &c. See also *Walch*, *Hist. der Ketz.*, vol. vi., p. 108-158.—*Tr.*]

(30) See *Jo. Harduin*, *Concilia*, tom. i., p. 82, &c. *Liberatus*, *Breviarium*, c. xii., p. 76. *Leo Magnus*, *Epist.* xciii., p. 625. *Nicephorus*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. xiv., c. 47, p. 550, &c. [*Walch*, *Historie der Kirchenversammlungen*, p. 301, &c., and *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi., p. 175-264. *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Leo*), vol. ii., p. 42-48, ed. Lond., 1750, 4to. The aged emperor *Theodosius II.* was managed by the *Eutychians*; and therefore he called such a council as would accomplish their wishes. In the council, *Eutyches* offered a confession of faith, which did not touch the point in debate; and this was accepted, without allowing his accusers to be heard. By acclamation the doctrine of *two natures* in the incarnate Word was condemned. *Dioscorus* then proposed to condemn *Flavianus* and *Eusebius*. Here opposition was made: and *Dioscorus* called on the imperial commissioners, who threw open the doors of the church; a band of soldiers and an armed mob rushed in. The terrified bishops no longer resisted. Every member (in all 149) signed the decrees. *Flavianus* was deposed and banished. *Eusebius* of Doryleum, *Theodoret* of Cypris, *Domnus* of Antioch, and several others, were also deposed. The decisions of this council were ratified by the emperor, and ordered to be everywhere enforced.—*Tr.*]

mies,—and also represented to the emperor, that an affair of such magnitude demanded a general council to settle it. *Theodosius* however, could not be persuaded to grant the request of *Leo*, and call such a council. But on his death, *Marcian* his successor, summoned a new council at Chalcedon in the year 451, which is called the *fourth general council*. In this very numerous assembly, the legates of *Leo* the Great, (who had already publicly condemned the doctrine of *Eutyches*, in his famous Epistle to *Flavianus*), were exceedingly active and influential. *Dioscorus* therefore was condemned, deposed, and banished to Paphlagonia, the Acts of the Ephesine council were rescinded, the Epistle of *Leo* was received as a rule of faith, *Eutyches*, who had already been divested of his clerical dignity and exiled by the emperor, was condemned though absent, and, not to mention the other decrees of the council, all Christians were required to believe, what most to this day do believe, that in *Jesus Christ* there is but *one person*, yet *two distinct natures* no way confounded or mixed.(31)

§ 16. This remedy, which was intended to heal the wounds of the church, was worse than the disease. For a great part of the Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though holding various sentiments in other respects, agreed in a vigorous opposition to this council of Chalcedon, and to the Epistle of *Leo* the Great which the council had adopted, and contended earnestly for *one nature* in *Christ*. Hence arose most deplorable discords, and a violence of parties almost exceeding credibility. In *Egypt*, the excited populace, after the death of the emperor *Marcian*, [A.D. 457], murdered *Proterius* the successor of *Dioscorus*; and appointed in his place *Timotheus Aclurus*, a defender of the doctrine of *one incarnate nature*. And although *Aclurus* was expelled from his office by the emperor *Leo*, yet under the [second succeeding] emperor *Basiliscus*, he recovered it. After his death, [A.D. 476], the friends of the council of Chalcedon elected *Timotheus* surnamed *Salophaciolus*; and the advocates for one nature, chose *Peter Moggus*. But in the year 482, *Salophaciolus* being dead, *Moggus*, by order of the emperor *Zeno* and by the influence

(31) [See the entire Acts of this council in all the Collections of Councils; e. g., *Binnius* and *Harduin*, tom. ii., p. 1, &c. See also *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. ii., c. 2, 4. *Cave*, Historia Litteraria, vol. i., p. 482–487. *Walch*, Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 307–314, and Historie der Ketzeren, vol. vi., p. 293–489. *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, (*Leo* I.), vol. ii., p. 56–100, ed. Lond., 1750, 4to. *Muenschel*, Dogmengesch., vol. iv., p. 96, &c. *Gieseler's* Text-book, by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 240.—The exposition of faith in the 5th action of this council, was designed to guard against both Eutychian and Nestorian errors. After rejecting the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan* creeds, with *Leo's* Letter to *Flavianus*, &c., they say: “Following therefore these holy fathers, we unitedly declare, that one and the same Son, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, is to be acknowledged as being perfect in his godhead, and perfect in his humanity; truly God, and truly man, with a

rational soul and a body; of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father, as to his Godhead; and of like essence (*ὁμοούσιος*) with us, as to his manhood; in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten (*γεννηθεῖς*) of the Father from all eternity, as to his Godhead; and of *Mary*, the mother of God (*θεοτόκος*) in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his manhood; recognised as one Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten; in two natures, unconfounded, unchanged, undivided, inseparable (*ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαρέτως, ἀχωρίως*); the distinction of natures not at all done away by the union; but rather, the peculiarity (*ιδιότης*) of each nature preserved, and combining (*συντρεχέσσης*) into one substance (*ὑπόστασιν*); not separated or divided into two persons (*πρόσωπα*); but one Son, Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord *Jesus Christ*: as the prophets before [taught] concerning him; so he, the Lord *Jesus Christ*, hath taught us, and the creed of the fathers hath transmitted to us.”—*Tr.*]

of *Acacius* bishop of Constantinople, obtained full possession of the see of Alexandria; and *John Talaia*, whom the Chalcedonians had elected, was removed.(32)

§ 17. In *Syria*, the abbot *Barsumas*, (a different person from *Barsumas* of Nisibis who established the Nestorian sect), having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon, went about propagating the doctrine of *Eutyches*: and by means of his disciple *Samuel*, he spread this doctrine among the neighbouring Armenians, about the year 460. Yet the Syrians are commonly represented as afterward giving up this harsher form of the Eutychian doctrine, under the guidance of *Xenaias* or *Philoxenus*, the bishop of *Mabug* [or *Hierapolis*], and the famous *Peter* [the *Fuller*], *Gnapheus* in Greek and *Fullo* in Latin. For these men denied, what *Eutyches* is said to have taught, that the human nature of *Christ* was *absorbed* in the divine; and simply inculcated, that *Christ* possessed *one nature*, which yet was a *twofold* or *compound*. Still, as this doctrine was equally inconsistent with the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, the believers in it most steadfastly rejected that council.(33)

§ 18. *Peter*, who was surnamed the *Fuller* because while a monk he pursued the trade of a fuller, got possession of the see of Antioch; and although he was often ejected and condemned on account of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, yet in the year 482 he obtained a full establishment in it, by authority of the emperor *Zeno*, through the influence of *Acacius* bishop of Constantinople.(34) This man, who was formed to promote discord and controversy, occasioned new contests, and was thought to aim at establishing a new sect called the *Theopaschites*; because he recommended to the eastern churches an addition to the hymn called *Trisagium*, by inserting after the words *O Holy God, O Holy Almighty, O Holy Eternal*, the clause *who wast crucified for us*. He undoubtedly made this addition with sectarian views, intending to establish men more firmly in his beloved doctrine, that of but *one nature* in *Christ*. But his adversaries, especially *Felix* of Rome, and others, perverted his meaning; and maintained that he intended to teach, that *all the three persons* in the Godhead were crucified; and therefore such as approved this form of the hymn were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western Christians rejected this form of the hymn, which they understood to refer to the whole Trinity, but the Oriental Christians continued to use it constantly, even down to modern times, without offence, because they refer the hymn to *Christ* only, or to but one person in the Trinity.(35)

(32) See *Liberatus*, Breviarium, cap. 16, 17, 18. *Eragrius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. ii., c. 8, lib. iii., c. 3. *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. ii., p. 410, &c.

(33) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. ii., p. 1-10, and his Diss. de *Monophysitis*, prefixed to this tome, p. ii., &c. [According to *Dr. Walch*, the parties were continually coming nearer together in doctrine, so that the *theological* dispute was sinking fast into a mere *logomachy*. But several questions of fact, or acts of the parties, became the subjects of lasting dispute and contention. See *Walch's* Historie der

Ketzereyen, vol. vi., p. 796, &c., 825-832. —*Tr.*]

(34) *Hen. Valesius*, Diss. de Petro Fullone et de Synodis adversus eum collectis; annexed to his *Scriptores Histor. Eccles.*, tom. iii., p. 173, &c.

(35) See *Hen. Noris*, de uno ex Trinitate carne passo liber, in his *Opp.*, tom. iii., Diss. i., c. 3, p. 782. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. i., p. 518, &c., tom. ii., p. 36, 180, &c., [*Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. vii., p. 237, &c., 329, &c., 339, &c., and *Suicer*, Thesaurus Eccles., tom. ii., p. 1310, &c.—*Tr.*]

§ 19. To settle these manifold dissensions, which exceedingly disquieted both the church and the state, the emperor *Zeno* in the year 482, by advice of *Acacius* the bishop of Constantinople, offered to the contending parties that *formula of concord* which is commonly called his *Henoticon*. This formula repeated and confirmed all that had been decreed in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians; but it made no mention of the council of Chalcedon. (36) For *Zeno* had been led by *Acacius*, to believe that the opposition of the disaffected was, not to the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon, but to the council itself. This formula of concord was subscribed by the leaders of the *Monophysite* party, *Peter Moggus* bishop of Alexandria, and *Peter Fullo* bishop of Antioch. It was likewise approved by *Acacius* of Constantinople, and by all the more moderate of both parties. But the violent, on both sides, resisted it; and complained that this *Henoticon* did injustice to the council of Chalcedon. (37) Hence arose new controversies, as troublesome as those which preceded.

§ 20. A considerable part of the *Monophysites* or *Eutychians* considered *Peter Moggus* as having committed a great crime, by acceding to the *Henoticon*; and therefore they united in a new party, which was called that of the *Accephali*, because they were deprived of their head or leader. (38) Afterwards this sect became divided into three parties, the *Anthropomor-*

(36) *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 14. *Laberatus*, Breviarium Histor., c. 18, [in both of which the *Henoticon* is given. *Dr. Mosheim's* description of this famous decree is very imperfect. In it the emperor explicitly recognises the creed of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan councils, as the only established and allowed creed of the church; and declares every person an alien from the true church, who would introduce any other. This creed, he says, was received by that council of Ephesus which condemned *Nestorius*; whom, with *Eutyches*, the emperor pronounces to be heretics. He also acknowledges the 12 chapters of *Cyril* of Alexandria, to be sound and orthodox; and declares *Mary* to be the mother of God, and Jesus Christ to possess two natures, in one of which he was *ὁμοούσιος* of like substance with the Father, and in the other *ὁμοούσιος* with us. Thus he fully recognised the doctrines of the council of Chalcedon, without alluding at all to that body; and affirming that these doctrines were embraced by all members of the true church, he calls upon all Christians to unite on this sole basis, and "anathematizes every person who has thought or thinks otherwise, either now or at any other time, whether at Chalcedon or in any other synod whatever; but more especially the aforesaid persons, *Nestorius* and *Eutyches*, and such as embrace their sentiments;" and concludes with renewed exhortations to a union on this basis.—This formula of union was happily calculated to unite the more considerate of both

parties. It required indeed some sacrifice of principle on the part of the *Monophysites*, or at least of their favourite phraseology; but it also required the dominant party to give up the advantage over their foes which they had obtained by the general council of Chalcedon. In Egypt, the *Henoticon* was extensively embraced; but the bishops of Rome were opposed to it, and were able to render it generally inefficient.—*Tr.*]

(37) See *Facundus* Hermianensis, Defensio trium Capitulorum, l. xii., c. 4.

(38) *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iii., c. 13. *Leontius* Byzant. de Sectis, tom. i., Lektion. Antiquar. Hen. Canisii, p. 537. *Timotheus* Presbyter, in Joh. Bapt. Cotelerius, Monument. Ecclesiae Graecae, tom. iii., p. 409. [From the time of the council of Chalcedon, the Eutychians gradually receded from the peculiar views of *Eutyches*, and therefore discarded the name of *Eutychians*, and assumed the more appropriate one of *Monophysites*, which indicated their distinguishing tenet, that the two natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but one nature. The whole party therefore, having long renounced *Eutyches* as their leader, when some of them also renounced *Peter Moggus*, they were indeed *Accephali*, without a head. Yet all the branches of this sect continued to bear the name of *Monophysites*, till late in the sixth century, when *Jacobus Baradaeus* raised them up from extreme depression through persecution, and they assumed the name of *Jacobites*, a name which they bear to this day.—*Tr.*]

phites, the *Barsanuphites*, and the *Esaianists*. And these sects were succeeded, in the next age, by others of which the ancients make frequent mention.(39) Yet the inquirer into the subject must be informed, that some of these Eutycheian sects are altogether imaginary; that others differed, not in reality, but only in terms; and that some were distinguished, not by their sentiments, but by some external rites and other outward circumstances. And they were all likewise of temporary duration; for in the next century they all became extinct, through the influence especially of *Jacobus Baradacus*.(40)

§ 21. The Roman pontiff *Felix III*. with his friends, attacked *Acacius* the bishop of Constantinople, who had favoured the *Henoticon*, as a betrayer of the truth, and excluded him from church communion. To justify this hostility, *Felix* and his successors taxed *Acacius* with favouring the Monophysites and their leaders, *Peter Moggus* and *Peter Fullo*; with contempt for the council of Chalcedon; and with some other things. But in reality, as many facts demonstrate, *Acacius* became thus odious to the Roman pontiffs, because he denied by his actions the supremacy of the Roman see, and was extremely eager to extend the jurisdiction and advance the honour of the see of Constantinople. The Greeks defended the character and memory of their bishop, against the aspersions of the Romans. This contest was protracted till the following century, when the pertinacity of the Romans triumphed, and caused the names of *Acacius* and *Peter Fullo* to be stricken from the sacred registers, and consigned as it were to perpetual infamy.(41)

§ 22. The cause of this so great a series of evils, appears to be a very small thing. It is said that *Eutyches* believed, that the divine nature of Christ absorbed his human nature; so that Christ consisted of but *one nature*, and that the *divine*. Yet whether this was the fact or not, is not sufficiently clear. This sentiment, however, together with *Eutyches*, was abandoned and rejected by the opposers of the council of Chalcedon, who were guided by *Xenaias* and *Peter Fullo*; and therefore, they are more properly called *Monophysites* than *Eutycheians*. For all who are designated by this name, hold that the divine and human natures of Christ were so united as to constitute but *one nature*, yet without any conversion, confusion, or commixture: and that this doctrine may not be understood differently from their real meaning, they often say, there is but *one nature* in Christ, yet it is *twofold* and *compound*.(42) With *Eutyches* they disclaim all connexion; but they venerate *Dioscorus*, *Barsumas*, *Xenaias*, and *Peter Fullo*, as pillars of their sect; and reject the decrees of the

(39) These sects are enumerated by *Ja. Basnage*, Prolegom. ad *Hen. Canisii* Lectiones Antiquas, cap. iii., and *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Diss. de Monophysitis, p. 7, &c.

(40) [For an account of *Jacobus Baradacus*, and his labours in resuscitating the fallen sect of the Monophysites, see below, cent. vi., part ii., chap. v., § 6, p. 417, &c., and *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. viii., p. 481-491.—*Tr.*]

(41) *Hen. Valesius*, Diss. de Synodis Romanis, in quibus damnatus est *Acacius*; subjoined to the third vol. of his Scriptores Hist. Eccles., p. 179, &c. *Ja. Basnage*,

Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i., p. 301, 380, 381, &c. Nouveau Dietionnaire Hist. Crit., tom. i., Article *Acacius*, p. 75, &c. *Dav. Blondell* de la Primauté dans l'Eglise, p. 279, &c. Acta Sanctorum, tom. iii., Februarii, p. 502, &c. [*Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (*Felix III*), vol. ii., p. 198, &c., ed. Lond., 1750, 4to.—*Tr.*]

(42) See the quotations from works of the Monophysites, by that excellent, and at times sufficiently ingenuous writer, *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. ii., p. 25, 26, 29, 34, 117, 133, 135, 277, 297, &c.

council of Chalcedon, together with the epistle of *Leo* the Great. The doctrine of the Monophysites, if we may judge from the language they use, appears to differ from the doctrine established by the council of Chalcedon, only in the mode of stating it, and not in reality.(43) Yet if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtilties by which they support their views.(44) perhaps we shall conclude, that their controversy with the Chalcedonians was not wholly a strife about words.

§ 23. Other troubles from the West, invaded the church in this century, and continued down through subsequent ages *Pelagius*(45) and *Cælestius*.(46) the former a Briton, and the latter an Irishman, both monks living at Rome, and in high reputation for their virtues and piety, conceived that the doctrines of Christians concerning the innate depravity of man and the necessity of internal divine grace in order to the illumination and renova-

(43) Many learned men consider this controversy as a mere strife about words. Among the *Monophysites* themselves, *Gregory Abulpharajus*, the most learned of the sect, was of this opinion. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii., p. 291. Add the Biblioth. Itaque, tom. xvii., p. 285. *Matur. Veis. la Croze*, Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, p. 23, and Hist. du Christ. d'Ethiopie, p. 14, &c. Even *Asseman*, (loc. cit., p. 297), though living at Rome, came near to avowing this opinion. [See above, note (28), p. 364, &c., and note (33), p. 367.—*Tr.*]

(44) See the subtle disputation of *Abulpharajus*, in *Asseman*, tom. ii., p. 288.

(45) [*Pelagius*, the heresiarch, was probably a Welchman, whose real name it is said was *Morgan* or *Marigena*, which was translated *πῆλᾱγιος*, *Pelagius*. He was a British monk, went to Rome about the year 400, imbibed the opinions of *Origen*, and began to publish his heretical sentiments concerning original sin and free grace, about A.D. 405. In the year 408, when the Goths were laying waste Italy, he and *Cælestius* retired to Sicily; and in 411, to Africa. *Cælestius* remained there, but *Pelagius* proceeded on to Egypt, to visit the monks of that country. In 415 he removed to Palestine, where he enjoyed the protection of *John*, bishop of Jerusalem. *Orosius* (being then in the East) impeached him; but he so far purged himself before the council of Diospolis in 417, as to be acquitted. But the next year he was condemned by the councils of Carthage and Milevi, as well as by the popes *Innocent* and *Zosimus*: and the emperor *Honorius* ordered him and his adherents to be expelled from Rome. *Theodotus* of Antioch now held a council, which condemned him. His subsequent history is unknown.—He was a man of distinguished genius, learning, and sanctity. Yet he was accused of disseminating as to his real sentiments.—He wrote

fourteen Books of *Commentaries* on Paul's Epistles;—(perhaps the very books published among the works of *Jerome*, and ascribed to that father); also an Epistle to *Demetrias*, de *Virginitate*, A.D. 413; (falsely ascribed both to *Jerome* and to *Augustine*, and published as theirs); a *Confession of his faith*, addressed to *Innocent* bishop of Rome, A.D. 417.—His last works are, *de Fide Trinitatis*, libri iii.—*Liber ἐνλογίων* sive *Testimoniorum*; (Collections from Scripture, in support of some doctrines);—*de libero Arbitrio*, libri iv.—*de Natura Liber*; and several Epistles.—See *Cave's* *Historia Litteraria*, tom. i., p. 381, &c.—*Tr.*]

(46) [*Cælestius*, of honourable birth, was a student at Rome when *Pelagius* arrived there. Embracing the views of his fellow-islander, he accompanied him to Sicily in 408, and to Africa in 411, where he remained some years. In 412 he was accused before the bishop of Carthage for heresy, and condemned by a council there. He appealed to the bishop of Rome; but went to Ephesus, where he became a presbyter. He afterwards disseminated his errors widely in Asia and the islands. In 416 he went to Constantinople, and the next year to Rome, when he so far satisfied *Zosimus*, as to obtain from him a recommendation to the bishops of Africa to restore him. But in 418 he was condemned by a synod at Rome, and was banished from the empire by the emperor. He now concealed himself in the East. In 429 the emperor forbid his coming to Constantinople. In 430, a synod at Rome condemned him; and also the council of Ephesus in 431. From that time we hear no more of him. He wrote a confession of his faith, several Epistles, and some short pieces: but none of his works have reached us entire, except his confession of faith, and perhaps some Epistles among those of *Jerome*. See *Cave*, *Historia Litteraria*, tom. i., p. 384, &c.—*Tr.*]

tion of the soul, tended to discourage human efforts, and were a great impediment to the progress of holiness, and of course ought to be rooted out of the church. They therefore taught, that what was commonly inculcated and believed, respecting a corruption of human nature derived to us from our first parents, was not true; that the parents of the human race sinned only for themselves, and not for their posterity; that men are now born as pure and innocent, as *Adam* was when God created him; that men therefore can, by their natural power, renovate themselves, and reach the highest degree of holiness; that external grace is indeed needful, to excite men to efforts; but that they have no need of any internal divine grace. (47)

(47) [According to *Dr. Walch*, (Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. iv., p. 735, &c.), as abridged by *Schlegel*, the system of *Pelagius* was as follows. (1) Men as they now come into the world, are, in respect to their powers and abilities, in the same state in which *Adam* was created. (2) *Adam* sinned; but his sin harmed no one but himself. (3) Human nature therefore, is not changed by the fall; and death is not a punishment for sin; but *Adam* would have died, had he not apostatized. For death is inseparable from our nature; and the same is true of the pains of childbirth, diseases, and outward evils, particularly in children. (4) Much less is the guilt of *Adam's* sin imputed to his offspring; for God would be unjust, if he imputed to us the actions of others. (5) Such imputation cannot be proved by the fact that *Christ* has redeemed infants; for this redemption is to be understood of their heirship to the kingdom of heaven, from which, an heirship to another's guilt, will not follow. (6) Neither does the baptism of infants prove such an imputation; for they thereby obtain the kingdom of heaven, which *Christ* has promised only to baptized persons. (7) When children die without baptism, they are not therefore damned. They are indeed excluded from the kingdom of heaven, but not from eternal blessedness. For the Pelagians held to a threefold state after death: *damnation*, for sinners; *the kingdom of heaven*, for baptized Christians who live a holy life, and for baptized children; and *eternal life*, for unbaptized children, and for unbaptized adults who live virtuous lives. (8) Much less is human nature *depraved*, in consequence of the fall of *Adam*. There is therefore no hereditary sin. (9) For, though it may be granted, that *Adam* is so far the author of sin, as he was the *first* that sinned, and by his example has seduced others; yet this is not to be understood of a *propagation* of sin by generation. (10) This supposed propagation of sin is the less admissible, because it would imply a *propagation of souls*, which is not true. (11) Neither can such a propagation be maintained, without im-

peaching the justice of God, introducing unconditional necessity, and destroying our freedom. (12) It is true, there are in men sinful propensities; in particular, the propensity for sexual intercourse; but these are not sins. (13) If sin was propagated by natural generation, and every motion of the sinful propensities and every desire therefor were sinful, then the marriage state would be sinful. (14) As man has ability to sin, so has he also, not only ability to discern what is good, but likewise power to desire it and to perform it. And this is the freedom of the will, which is so essential to man, that he cannot lose it. (15) The *grace*, which the Scriptures represent as the source of morally good actions in man, *Pelagius* understood to denote various things. For he understood the word (a) of the whole constitution of our nature, and especially of the endowment of *free will*: (b) of the promulgation of the divine law: (c) of the forgiveness of past sins, without any influence on the future conduct: (d) of the example of *Christ's* holy life, which he called the *grace of Christ*: (e) of the internal change in the understanding, whereby the truth is recognised; which he called *grace*, and also the *assistance* of the Holy Spirit: (f) and sometimes *grace*, with him, was equivalent to *baptism* and *blessedness*. (16) Man is as capable of securing salvation, by the proper use of his powers, as of drawing on himself damnation by the misuse of them. (17) And therefore God has given men a law; and this law prescribes nothing impossible. (18) God requires from men a perfect personal obedience to his law. (19) Actions originating from ignorance or forgetfulness, are not sinful. (20) So also natural propensities or the craving of things sinful, is not of itself sinful. (21) Therefore perfect personal obedience to the law, on the part of men, is practicable, through the uncorruptness of the powers of nature. (22) And by grace, (consisting in external divine aids, the right use of which depends on men's free will), good works are performed. They did not deny all internal change in men by grace; but they

These doctrines and those connected with them, the above-mentioned monks secretly disseminated at Rome. But in the year 410, on account of the invasion of the Goths, they retired from Rome, and going first to Sicily and thence to Africa, they more openly advanced their opinions. From Africa, *Pelagius* went to Egypt; but *Cælestius* continued at Carthage, and solicited a place among the presbyters of that city. But his novel opinions being detected, he was condemned in a council at Carthage A.D. 412; and leaving the country, he went to Asia. From this time, *Augustine* the famous bishop of Hippo, began to assail with his pen the doctrines of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*; and to him chiefly belongs the praise of suppressing this sect at its very birth. (48)

confined it solely to the *understanding*, and controverted all internal change of the *will*. They also limited the necessity of this grace, by maintaining that it was not indispensable to all men; and that it only *facilitated* the keeping of God's commandments. (23) This possibility of performing good works by the free use of our natural powers, they endeavoured to prove, by the existence of virtuous persons among the pagans: and likewise (24) from the saints mentioned in the Old Testament; whom they divided into two classes, the *first* from Adam to Moses, who like the pagans had only natural grace; the *second* from Moses to Christ, who had the grace of the law. Some of the saints who had the law, were all their lifetime without sin; others sinned indeed, but being converted, they ceased to sin, and yielded a perfect obedience to the law. (25) The grace whereby perfect obedience becomes possible, is a consequence of precedent good works; (26) and such obedience is absolutely necessary to salvation. (27) Sins originating from a misuse of human freedom, and continued by imitation and by custom, were forgiven, under the Old Testament, solely on account of good works; and under the New Testament, through the grace of Christ. (28) Their idea of the way of salvation, then, was this. A man who has sinned, converts himself; that is, he leaves off sinning, and this by his own powers. He believes on *Christ*; that is, he embraces his doctrines. He is now baptized; and on account of this baptism, all his previous sins are forgiven him, and he is without sin. He has the instructions and the example of *Christ*, whereby he is placed in a condition to render perfect obedience to the divine law. This he *can* do, if he will; and he can either withstand all temptations, or fall from grace. (29) Moreover they admitted conditional decrees; the condition of which was, either foreseen good works, or foreseen sin.—*Tr.*]

(48) The history of the Pelagians has been written by many persons: as by *Ja. Usher*, in his *Antiquitat. ecclesiæ Britan.* *Joh. a*

Lact, a Netherlander; *Ger. Joh. Vossius*; *Hen. Noris*; *Jo. Garnier*, in his Supplement to the works of *Theodoret*; *Cornel. Jansen*, in his *Augustinus*; and others. The French Jesuit, *Jac. de Longueval* left a MS. *Historia Pelagiana*. See his Preface to the 9th vol. of his *History of the Gallican church*, p. iv. But among so many writers, no one yet has exhausted the whole subject, or shown himself free from undue partiality. [This partiality is to be attributed to the renewal of these controversies. In all ages there have been some in the Christian church, who coincided, either wholly or partially, with *Pelagius*, and who opposed the doctrine of *Augustine*. On the other hand, the scholastics adopted the greatest part of *Augustine's* sentiments. And these two parties have never been at rest. The affair with *Gotteschaleus*, and the contests between the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*, kept up these disquietudes; and in the times of the reformation, the commotions were increased, when *Luther* and *Erasmus* came upon the arena, and the council of Trent made a considerable part of the Pelagian system to be articles of faith. From that period onward, the Protestants have maintained, that the Catholic church holds, not what *Augustine* taught, but what *Pelagius*, or at least the Semipelagians inculcated; and the Catholic doctors endeavour to maintain the contrary. The Dominicans and the Jesuits, and also the Jansenists and Jesuits, have moved controversies within their own church respecting Pelagianism and the opinions of *Augustine*; and among the Protestants, the charge of Pelagianism has been brought against the Arminians, and likewise against various individual doctors. No wonder therefore, if all these learned writers of the Pelagian history are often betrayed into errors by the prejudices of their party.—*Schl. Dr. Walch's* account is full and candid, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. iv., p. 519–546, and for the *Semipelagians*, vol. v., p. 3–228. *Münscher's* statement of the opinions of the different parties is lucid and

§ 24. *Pelagius* was more fortunate in the East. For under the patronage of *John* bishop of Jerusalem, who considered the doctrines of *Pelagius* as according with the opinions of *Origen*, to which *John* was attached, *Pelagius* freely professed his sentiments, and gathered disciples. And although he was impeached in the year 415, by *Orosius* a Spanish presbyter, whom *Augustine* had sent into Palestine, yet a convention of bishops at Jerusalem dismissed him without censure; and a little after, in a council held at Diospolis in Palestine, he was entirely acquitted of crime and error.(49) The controversy being removed to Rome, *Zosimus*, (who was made pontiff in the year 417), misled partly by the ambiguous and apparently sound confession of faith which *Celestius* then residing at Rome offered, and partly by the flattering and insidious letters and protestations of *Pelagius*, pronounced sentence in favour of these monks, and decided that wrong had been done to men of correct sentiments by their adversaries.(50) But the Africans, led by *Augustine*, continued perseveringly to assail them with councils, books, and letters. *Zosimus* therefore being better informed, changed his opinion, and severely condemned those whom he had before extolled. Afterwards, that Ephesine council which hurled its thunders against *Nestorius*, also condemned them; and now the Gauls, the Britons, and the Palestinians, by their councils, and the emperors by their laws and penalties, crushed the sect in its commencement.(51)

§ 25. These unhappy contests produced, as is often the case, other dissensions equally hurtful. As *Augustine* did not at first state with sufficient uniformity and clearness, his opinions respecting the divine grace necessary to salvation, and the decrees of God in regard to the future condition of individual men, he gave occasion to certain monks of Adrumetum and to some persons in Gaul, to believe that God has *predestinated* well vouched; Dogmengeschichte, vol. iv., p. 122-262.—Tr.]

(49) See *Gabr. Daniel*, Histoire du Concile de Diospolis, among the shorter works of this eloquent and learned Jesuit, published, Paris, 1724, 3 vols. 4to, in tom. i., p. 635-671. [Our whole information respecting these councils is derived from the opposers of *Pelagius*, *Orosius*, *Augustine*, &c. The first was held at Jerusalem, in the month of July, 415. It was merely an assemblage of presbyters, with bishop *John* for president. *Pelagius* and the council spoke Greek; but *Orosius* the accuser, Latin only. This gave great advantage to *Pelagius*. *Orosius* stated what had been done in Africa: *Pelagius* said, he had no concern with those councils. *Orosius* was called upon to make his charges specific against *Pelagius*. He then stated, that he had heard *Pelagius* affirm, that *a man may become sinless if he will*; and that *it is an easy thing to obey the law of God perfectly*. *Pelagius* explained, that he meant it should be understood, *with the aids of divine grace*. The council were satisfied with this explanation. The second council, which sat at Diospolis or Lydda, in December, 415, was composed of 14 bishops. The accusers were two Gallic bishops, *Heros* and *Lazarus*,

but neither of them present. They sent in a long list of errors, which they said *Pelagius* and his followers had taught. *Pelagius* replied, that these were not *his* opinions, that he anathematized them, and that he believed what the Catholic church had always held. With this the council were satisfied. But the sentence of the Africans still remained in force; and therefore *Pelagius* and *Celestius* both sought the interference of the bishop of Rome.—Tr.]

(50) See *Jo. Frick*, *Zosimus* in *Clemente* xi. redivivus, Ulm, 1719, 4to, [and *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, (*Zosimus*), vol. i., p. 331, &c., ed. Lond., 1749, 4to.—Tr.]

(51) See *Ger. Jo. Vossius*, *Historia Pelagiana*, l. i., c. 55, p. 130. There are also some learned remarks on this controversy in the *Bibliothèque Italique*, tom. v., p. 74, &c. The writers on both sides are enumerated by *Jo. Fr. Buddeus*, *Isagoge ad Theol.*, tom. ii., p. 1071. *W. Wall* has likewise given a neat and learned, though imperfect history of the Pelagian contest, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i., ch. 13, [p. 192-282, ed. Lond., 1705], which his learned translator [into Latin, *J. L. Schlosser*] has enriched with excellent remarks.

the wicked, not only to suffer eternal punishment, but also to commit sin and incur the guilt which will merit that punishment; and of course to believe, that both the good and the sinful actions of men were, from all eternity, divinely predetermined and fixed by an inevitable necessity. These persons were called *Predestinarians*. Yet this doctrine did not spread far; for *Augustine* more clearly explained his views, and the councils of Arles and Lyons publicly rejected it.(52) There are however very learned men, who deny that such a sect of *Predestinarians* ever had existence; and who maintain, that the followers of *Augustine* inculcated his doctrines truly and correctly, and were slanderously reproached by the Semipelagians with these so great errors.(53)

(52) See *Ja. Sirmond*, *Historia Prædestinatiana*, tom. iv. of his *Opp.*, p. 271, &c. *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii., liv. xii., cap. ii., p. 698. *Dion. Petavius*, *Dogmat. Theol.*, tom. vi., p. 168, 174, &c. [According to *W. Münscher*, (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iv., p. 164, &c., 215, &c.), all the fathers, before *Augustine*, held to a conditional election, that is, an election founded on the foreseen good works of men. So *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary* of Poitiers, *Ambrose*, *Jerome*. They likewise held, that *Christ* died for all men; and were strangers to the idea of an atonement made only for the elect. So *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Athanasius*, *Basil* the Great, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, and *Jerome*. They also held that the saints may, and do, fall from grace and perish. So *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Athanasius*, and *Hilary*. Even *Augustine* himself, in the earlier part of his ministry, held election to be conditional. But as early as the year 397, he discovered that such an election was inconsistent with man's entire dependance on grace for ability to perform good works; a doctrine which he held most firmly. He therefore advanced the new theory, that God's electing some to everlasting life depended upon his mere good pleasure, in view of reasons known only to himself; that God from eternity predestinated some to repentance, faith, good works, and ultimately to salvation; while others he left to go on in sin, and perish everlastingly; that the number of the elect is fixed unalterably and for ever; that this election of some to salvation through grace, while others are left without grace, and perish in their sins, is no injustice on the part of God; because all men deserve to be left in their sins. He denied, that God really wills the salvation of all men; and he justified preaching the Gospel to all, on the ground that we know not who are elected and who are not.—When this theory was advanced by *Augustine*, it met with opposition; and it was not, by those who embraced it, always stated as guarded-

ly as it was by its author. Hence, those opposed to it, drew the frightful picture of it which has been called *Predestinarianism*. This system, as stated by *Dr. Münscher*, (*ibid.*, p. 257), embraced the following positions; namely, that the wicked are predestinated, not only to punishment, but also to commit sin; that baptism does not remove all sin; that the godliness of the righteous does not profit them; nor will the wicked be damned on account of their sins; that in general, God will not judge men according to their deeds; that it is useless to address exhortations either to saints or sinners. *Dr. Münscher* subjoins: All these were consequences drawn from the doctrine of unconditional decrees taught by *Augustine*; but they were consequences which he expressly rejected.—*Tr.*]

(53) See *Gilb. Mauguin*, *Fabula prædestinatiana confutata*; which he subjoined to a *Collection* of various authors who wrote in the ninth century concerning predestination and grace, vol. ii., p. 447, &c., Paris, 1650, 4to. [*Mauguin* was a French statesman, who with much theological and historical learning maintained with the Jansenists against the Jesuits, that there never were any *Predestinarians*.—*Schl.*] *Fred. Spanheim*, *Introduct. ad Historiam Eccles.* in his *Opp.*, tom. i., p. 993. *Ja. Basnage*, *Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon*, and *Praefat. ad Faustum Regiensem*, in *Hen. Canisii* *Lectio. Antiquar.*, tom. i., p. 315, 348. The author of the *Life of Jo. Launoï*, in his *Works*, tom. iv., pt. ii., p. 343, namely *Granet*, informs us, that *Sirmond* encouraged *Launoï* to undertake a refutation of *Mauguin*; but that *Launoï*, having examined the subject, fell in with the opinions of *Mauguin*. [Father *Sirmond* was a champion among the Jesuits, who were charged by the Jansenists with departing from the opinions of *Augustine*; and he hoped to confute this charge, if he could only demonstrate incontrovertibly that there really was a sect of *Predestinarians* existing in the times of *Augustine*. *Sirmond* had published an an-

§ 26. On the other hand, *John Cassianus*, (a monk who came to Mar-sailles in France from the East, and established a monastery there), and certain others, about the year 430, endeavoured to modify in some measure the system of *Augustine*.(54) Many persons falling in with their views,

cient book, at Paris, 1643, bearing the title : *Prædestinatus, sive Prædestinatorum hæresis, et libri S. Augustini temere adscripti refutatio*. The work consists of three Books. The *first* contains a list of heresies, of which that of the Predestinarians is the ninetieth. The *second* Book bears the superscription : *Liber secundus, sub nomine Augustini confictus, nonagesimam hæresin continens, quæ asserit, Dei prædestinatione peccata committi*. The *third* Book contains a refutation of the pretended tract of *Augustine*. This work is certainly ancient, and most probably to be ascribed to the younger *Arnobius*. But the credibility of its statements is much impaired, by the fact that its author was a Semipelagian, and wrote more as a polemic than as a historian.—*Schl.*—This petty dispute, whether there was in ancient times a sect of Predestinarians, when thoroughly examined, will perhaps turn out to be a contest about terms. [To the question, whether there existed in the fifth and sixth centuries a sect of Predestinarians, some of the learned have answered, *yes* ; and others, *no*. Those who answer in the latter manner, believe the sect of Predestinarians was a fiction of the Semipelagians, who used this artifice in order to bring odium on *Augustine* and his followers. This opinion was embraced by the Jansenists, the Reformed, and among the Lutherans by *Dr. Semler* in his History of religious doctrines, prefixed to the 3d vol. of *Baumgarten's* Polemic Theology. Those who answer the question affirmatively, are divisible into two classes. They admit directly, that there were Predestinarians who were condemned by the orthodox church ; yet they deny that *Augustine* taught, what they admit to have been the errors of this sect. Of this opinion were the Jesuits and the early Lutheran divines. Others, while they admit all this, add that the opposers of the sect were principally Semipelagians, who aimed to bring contempt on the Augustinian doctrine. They hold that only a few individual persons (as a few monks of *Adrumetum* and *Lucidus*) fell into these errors ; and therefore they never constituted a distinct sect or heretical community. This opinion has been defended by *Noris* and *Graveson* among the Catholics, by the two *Basnages* among the Reformed, and in the Lutheran church by *Pfaff*, *Buddens*, the elder *Walch*, and by *Dr. Bernhold* in a disputation at Alt-

dorf, 1737 ; and it is admitted by the younger *Walch*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., 280, &c. Among those who regard the whole question, respecting the existence of a Predestinarian sect, as a contest about words, besides *Dr. Mosheim*, may be reckoned *Weismann*, in his *Memorabil. Hist. Eccl.*, tom. i., p. 410, &c. And in fact, there is something like a contest about words, in the dispute whether there was really a Predestinarian sect. For very much depends on the definition of the word *sect* or *heresy*. If the term is used to denote a society of persons who have a particular mode of worship, then a Predestinarian sect never had existence. But if the term denote a set of religious opinions, embraced and defended by individual persons here and there, but who never separated from the general church, then it may be said there was a sect of Predestinarians. When we view the controversy in all its extent, we can by no means regard it as a controversy about words. See *Walch*, *Hist. der Ketz.*, vol. v., p. 218–288.—*Schl.*]

(54) [The views of *John Cassianus* are exhibited in his *Collatio xiii. Patrum*, Opp., p. 491, &c., and are well abridged by *Dr. Mucnscher* (*Dogmengesch.*, vol. iv., p. 246, &c.) as follows. As *John Cassianus* is the only writer of those times who has exhibited a connected view of the doctrines of the so called Massilians, from his works alone can the deviations of these teachers from the opinions of *Augustine* be derived. His primary object was, to exhibit the true worth and the necessity of divine grace, but without overthrowing the freedom of the human will. Man, said he, needs at all times divine aid ; and he can do nothing to secure his salvation, without it. But he must not be inactive on his part. All men have indeed original sin, and are subject to death ; but a knowledge of God, and their free will, they have not lost. It can neither be maintained that the commencement of what is good in us always originates from God, nor that it always originates from ourselves. Sometimes it is of God, who first excites good thoughts and purposes in us. But sometimes it is the man, who takes the first step, and whom God then meets with his assistance. In either case, it is God who, when he sees the spark of goodness glimmering in the soul, or has himself lighted it up by his own working, cherishes and sustains this

a sect arose which its adversaries have called that of the *Semipelagians*. The sentiments of the *Semipelagians* are represented differently by those that oppose them. The greater part however, represent them as holding, that men do not need *internal preventing grace*; but that every man can, by his natural powers, commence the renovation of his soul; and can have and exercise faith in *Christ*, and a purpose of living a holy life: yet that no man can persevere in the begun course, unless he is constantly supported by divine assistance and grace. The disciples of *S. Augustine* in Gaul, contended warmly with this class of men; but they could not vanquish them.(55) For as their doctrines coincided with the modes of

spark. God's unchangeable will is, that all men may be saved; and when any one is lost, it is contrary to his designs. At all times therefore the grace of God is co-operating with our will, and strengthens and defends it; yet so, that he sometimes waits for or requires from us some efforts to choose what is good, that he may not seem to confer his gifts on the indolent and inactive. The grace of God however is always unmerited, as it bestows on the weak and worthless efforts of men such valuable favours and such unfading glory. The ways in which God brings men to possess goodness, are manifold and incomprehensible; but he always treats each individual, according to his character and desert. Yet this is not to be understood, as if grace was imparted to each one according to his merits. On the contrary, the grace of God far transcends all human desert, and sometimes transcends the unbelief of men, (i. e., brings the unbelieving to have faith).—From these propositions, (which are arranged differently from what they are by the author, but are expressed in almost his own words), it appears, that *Cassian* rejected unconditional election, the inability of man to do good, irresistible grace, and the Augustinian idea of the saints' perseverance. Dr. *Muensch* adds, that the principal point in which the Massilians departed from the adherents to *Augustine*, lay in this, that man has, in his freedom of will, some power to do good; by exerting which he does not indeed merit the grace of God, yet he makes himself fit to receive it; and that God, in view of these human efforts, has determined to bestow his grace and eternal bliss.—The evidence by which the Massilians supported their opinions, was various. Their chief argument was this, that in the scriptures faith and virtue are sometimes required of men, and sometimes represented as the gift of God; and these different passages cannot be reconciled, unless it be allowed that faith and virtue come principally from God, and yet that free will has some part in them. This doctrine moreover, they said, coincided with the

standing belief of the church; while the opposite doctrine was new, and also objectionable, because it annihilated human freedom, introduced an unavoidable necessity in human actions, and by holding up the idea that a man's own efforts were of no avail, encouraged men to remain inactive.—*Tr.*]

(55) *Jas Basnage*, Histoire de l'Eglise, tome ii., liv. xii., cap. i. Histoire litteraire de la France, tome ii., Pref, p. ix, &c. *Vossius*, Historia Pelagiana, lib. vi., p. 538, &c. *Irenaeus Veronensis*, i. e., *Scipio Maffei*, de Haeresi Semipelagiana, in the Opuscula scientifica of *Angelo Calogera*, tom. xxix., p. 399, &c. [As soon as *Augustine* was informed by *Prosper* and *Hilary*, of the existence of these opposers of his system at Marseilles, he wrote his two pieces designed to confute them, de Praedestinatione Sanctorum Liber, and de Domino perseverantiae Liber, both addressed to *Prosper* and *Hilary*. Soon afterwards, A.D. 430, *Augustine* died; and *Prosper* and *Hilary* carried on the controversy. In 431, they visited Rome, and obtained the patronage of *Celestine* the pontiff: but not succeeding by means of councils and popes, *Prosper* applied himself to writing against the errorists. His strictures on *Cassian's* 13th Collation is a valuable performance. The Libri ii. de vocatione Gentium, (i. e., on the universality of the call to embrace the Gospel salvation), seems not to be his: for it does not come up fully to his views, as expressed in his reply to *Cassian*. Though it concedes more to the Semipelagians than *Augustine* and *Prosper* did, still it was on the same side. The majority in France, as well as nearly all the Greeks, were in sentiment with the Semipelagians. About the year 472, one *Lucidus* a presbyter, having avowed pure Augustinianism, *Faustus* the bishop of Reiz in Gaul, wrote him a letter, and afterwards accused him before the council of Arles, A.D. 475. The council disapproved the sentiments of *Lucidus*, who retracted; and they encouraged *Faustus* to write his ii. Books de libero Arbitrio, in opposition to *Augustine's* views.

thinking of the majority of people, and particularly of the monks, and were approved by the most respectable authors, especially among the Greeks, and as *Augustine* himself and his friends did not venture utterly to reject and condemn them, as pernicious and impious, no efforts could prevent them from spreading far and wide.

§ 27. From this time therefore, began those knotty controversies concerning the nature and the mode of that divine agency or grace which men need in order to salvation, which have unhappily divided Christians in every subsequent age, and which are still protracted, to the grief of all pious and good men. Many in all ages have followed the system of *Augustine*, who ascribed everything to the grace of God, and nothing to human sufficiency; yet they differed in the manner in which they explained this system. But a still greater number have agreed with *Casarian*; whose system, though differently explained, has spread from the schools of the Gallic monks over all the nations of Europe. The Greeks

A few months after, a synod at Lyons also decided in favour of Semipelagian sentiments. But early in the following century, *Casarius* of Arles, came out a zealous Augustinian; and with the aid of some Scythian monks and some others, he caused that doctrine to spread and to gain the ascendancy. The synods of Orange and Valence, A.D. 529, declared in favour of it. The opposers of Augustinianism were in that age denominated *Pelagians*; from their leaning towards the sentiments of Pelagius; also *Massilians*, from the residence of their principal writers at (*Massilia*) *Marscilles*. It was the schoolmen of after ages who denominated them *Semipelagians*.—According to Dr. *Walch*, they admitted original sin; but probably confined its effects to our liability to temporal death. They supposed all the posterity of *Adam* have ability to discern what is right, and freedom of will to choose it: yet that none can be saved, but by grace, through *Christ*, or by means of his blood and a Christian baptism; that *Christ* died for all men; that God wills the salvation of all; and therefore proffers his grace to all; so that all men may be saved, if they will. The way of salvation, they supposed, is, to believe, to practise virtue, and to persevere in it to the end. Faith is, believing that God has determined to save all that obey the Gospel. This faith originates altogether from our free will. From the same source, and from the use of our natural powers, originate the beginnings of a right temper, the desiring, seeking, and knocking. Yet neither this faith, nor these beginnings of a right temper, are good works; that is, they have no proper efficacy to merit the assistance of God, or that grace which is necessary to the performance of good works; and yet they may induce God to impart his grace. Thus it is God who gives the grace, by which faith is

strengthened and good works performed; yet its due influence must be allowed to free will, and not everything be ascribed to grace. The connexion and co-operation of both are very necessary; for grace only helps or assists. True faith may be lost; its retention depends solely on man's free will; and it is not true, that divine grace imparts to man a special gift of perseverance in goodness. God has a twofold decree, respecting man's salvation; first, his general desire that all may be saved; and secondly, his design actually to save those who shall persevere in holiness to the end. *Augustine's* doctrine of predestination is very objectionable; it wholly subverts man's freedom, makes God the author of sin, and renders it vain to exhort sinners to repent or saints to persevere in religion. Election to salvation is conditional, depending on the foreseen conduct of men in regard to obedience to the divine commands. To the puzzling question of their opposers, what becomes of so many baptized children who die before they are competent to exert their free will, and of so many adults who never were favoured with a knowledge of the Gospel; they replied, first, that baptized children dying in infancy, are saved on the ground that God foresaw they would persevere in religion if their lives had been prolonged; and secondly, that so many children as die without baptism, are deprived of that ordinance, and so many adults as are deprived of a knowledge of the Gospel, (both being doomed to damnation), suffer these privations, because God foresaw that the former would not live virtuously, and that the latter would not embrace the Gospel, if they had an opportunity. See Dr. *Walch's* ample account of this religious party, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. v., p. 3-218.—*Tr.*]

and the other Orientals held the same views, before *Cassian* ; nor have they departed from them to this day. The opinions of *Pelagius* appeared to most persons too bold and loose, and therefore were never openly avowed by large numbers. Yet in every age some may be found, who ascribed to man, as it is said *Pelagius* did, full power by his own strength to keep the whole law of God.

CENTURY SIXTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPEROUS EVENTS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Progress of Christianity in the East,—§ 2. and in the West.—§ 3. Jews converted in several Places.—§ 4. The Miracles of this Century.

§ 1. IT is evident from the historical records of the Greek empire, that several barbarous tribes, particularly some residing near the Black Sea, were converted to Christianity by the efforts of the Greek emperors and the bishops of Constantinople. Among these were the *Abasgi*, a barbarous nation inhabiting the shores of the Euxine and as far as Mount Caucasus, who embraced Christianity under the emperor Justinian.(1) The *Heruli*, who dwelt along the other side of the Ister [or Danube], became Christians under the same reign:(2) also the *Alani*, the *Lazi*, and the *Zani*, and some other tribes, whose residence is not definitely known at the present day.(3) But there is abundant evidence, that nothing was required of these nations except externally to profess *Christ*, cease from offering victims to their gods, and learn certain forms to be repeated: the imbuing their minds with true religion and piety, was not even thought of. It is certain, that after their conversion they retained their rude and savage manners, and were famous for rapines, murders, and every species of iniquity. In most provinces of the Greek empire, and even in the city of Constantinople, many idolaters were still lurking in concealment. A great multitude of these were baptized, during the reign of *Justin*, by *John* bishop of Asia.(4)

§ 2. In the West, *Remigius* bishop of Rheims, who has been called the *Apostle of the Gauls*, laboured with great zeal to convert idolaters to *Christ*; and not without success, especially after *Cloris* the king of the Franks had embraced Christianity.(5) In Britain, *Ethelbert* king of Kent,

(1) *Procopius*, de Bello Gothico, lib. iv., c. 3. *Le Quin*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 1351, &c. [Their adoration (like that of the ancient Germans) had been previously given to forests and lofty trees. The emperor *Justinian* sent priests among them, and erected a church for them dedicated to the Virgin *Mary*; and he rendered the people more inclined to become Christians, by prohibiting their king from carrying on a shameful traffic in eunuchs. See *Procopius*,

ubi sup. *Neander*, Kirchengesch., vol. ii., part i., p. 247.—*Tr.*]

(2) *Procopius*, de Bello Goth., l. ii., c. 14.

(3) [See *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. iv., c. 20, 22, 23. All these conversions took place near the commencement of the reign of *Justinian*, about A. D. 530.—*Tr.*]

(4) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. ii., p. 85.

(5) Histoire littéraire de la France, tome iii., p. 155, &c.

the most distinguished of the seven Anglo-Saxon kings among whom the island was then divided, married near the close of this century a Christian wife named *Bertha*, the daughter of *Cherebert* king of Paris; and she, partly by her own influence, and partly by that of the ministers of religion whom she brought with her, impressed her husband favourably towards Christianity. The king being thus prepared for it, *Gregory* the Great, at the suggestion undoubtedly of the queen, sent forty Benedictine monks, with one *Augustine* at the head of them, into Britain, in the year 596, to complete the work which the queen had begun. This *Augustine*, with the queen's assistance, converted the king and the greatest part of the inhabitants of Kent to Christian worship, and laid the foundation of the modern British church.(6) Among the *Picts* and *Scots*, *Columbas* an Irish

(6) *Beda*, *Hist. Eccles. gentis Anglor.*, lib. i., c. 23, p. 55, &c., ed. Chiflet. *Rapin Thoyras*, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, tom. i., p. 222, &c. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iii., Februar., p. 470, where is an account of *Ethelbert*, king of Kent. [The marriage of *Bertha*, is said to have been consummated A.D. 579. It had been stipulated, that she should enjoy her own religion and worship. She therefore had her private chaplain, and a small church. *Gregory* the Great, before he was made pope, was so captivated with the beauty of some English youth offered for sale at Rome as slaves, that he wished to go himself as a missionary to England; but the Roman people restrained him. He was created pontiff in 590; and in 596 he persuaded *Augustine*, abbot of St. Andrew's at Rome, to undertake the conversion of the English nation. *Augustine*, with a small retinue of monks, set forward; but he scarcely reached France, before the courage of the whole party failed, and *Augustine* returned to obtain leave to abandon the enterprise. *Gregory* however would not give it up; he exhorted *Augustine* to proceed, assigned him more assistants, gave him letters of introduction to bishops and princes on the way, and dismissed him. *Augustine* now proceeded through France, crossed the channel, and landed with his 40 monks on the isle of Thanet in Kent. There king *Ethelbert* met him, learned his object, gave him access to the country, promised him protection and sustenance, but refused to embrace the new religion till after further examination. *Augustine* and retinue then marched to Canterbury the capitol, with a waving banner and a silver crucifix, chanting: *O Lord, we beseech thee, in thy great mercy, to remove thy fury and thy wrath from this city, and from thine house, for we have sinned: hallelujah.* For a considerable time, *Augustine* and his monks worshipped in the queen's chapel; and fasted, and prayed, and chanted hymns almost constantly. The next year, A.D. 597, the king had his mind made up, was baptized, and allowed,

but did not compel, any of his subjects to follow his example. In a short time however, all Kent was nominally Christian. Having been so successful, *Augustine* this year went to Gaul, and was ordained archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England; and returned with a fresh accession of monks. In the year 598, he sent two monks, *Laurentius* and *Peter*, to Rome to inform *Gregory* of the prosperous state of the mission. *Gregory* exulted in its success, and sent back the messengers, with additional labourers, the pall for the new archbishop, numerous presents for the cathedral, including holy relics, letters to the king and queen, &c. He confirmed *Augustine's* jurisdiction over all England, exhorted him to proceed with his work, advised him not to demolish the pagan temples, but to convert them into churches, purifying them with holy water; for the pagans would love to worship in the places long held sacred; yet the idols must be destroyed. He also advised, that the people be allowed on festal days to assemble around the churches, erect booths, and there feast themselves, much as during their pagan state, yet without sacrificing to their idols. *Gregory* likewise answered several questions of *Augustine*, advising him and his associates to continue to live in monasteries, to use such a liturgy as should seem best suited to the country; and instructing him how thieves should be treated, how many bishops must concur in the ordination of a bishop, how he must demean himself among the Gallic bishops, and what was to be thought of some ceremonial impurities. In 602, *Augustine* built his cathedral at Canterbury; and he erected a monastery in which to train men for the ministry. In the year 604, he attempted to bring under his jurisdiction and to a conformity with his churches, all the clergy and churches of the ancient Britons whom the Saxons had conquered and driven chiefly into Wales. A council was held for the purpose. But as *Augustine* was quite bigoted and somewhat overbearing, nothing was effected. In the

monk, began the work of administering Christian baptism.(7) In Germany, the *Bohemians*, the *Thuringians*, and *Bavarians* are said to have received Christianity;(8) which to many, however, appears extremely doubtful. Of these sacred enterprises among the heathen, no one will form a high opinion, after learning from the writers of this and the following ages that these nations still retained a great part of their former paganism, and that they so worshipped *Christ* as to reject his instructions, by their lives, their deeds, and their allowed practices.(9)

§ 3. That a great many Jews in various places, made a profession of Christianity, is certain. In the East, *Justinian* persuaded those resident at Borium a city of Libya, to acknowledge *Christ*.(10) In the West, many Jews yielded to the zeal and efforts of the kings of Gaul and Spain, and to those of *Gregory* the Great and *Avilus* [bishop of Clermont]. But it should be added, that far more were induced to make profession of Christianity, by the rewards offered by the princes and by the fear of punishment, than by the force of arguments. In Gaul during the reign of *Childeric*, the Jews were compelled to receive baptism: and the same thing was done in Spain.(11) But *Gregory* the Great wished this practice to be discontinued.(12)

mean time, the conversion of other Saxons beyond the kingdom of Kent, proceeded successfully; and several bishops were ordained, particularly a bishop for London, and another for Rochester. St. Paul's church in London was now founded; and the next year the *West monastery* (*Westminster*) adjoining London. In the year 607, *Augustine* died, and was succeeded in the see of Canterbury by *Laurentius*. See *Beda*, Hist. Eccl. Brit., lib. i., c. 23, &c., and lib. ii., c. 2, 3. *Mabillon*, Annal. Benedict., tom. i., ann. 596-607. The legendary history of *Augustine*, both in a larger and a smaller form, by *Goscelin* a monk of the 11th century, may be found in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., tom. i., p. 485-543.—Tr.]

(7) *Beda*, Histor. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 4, p. 134.—[Some rays of light had penetrated the southernmost counties of Scotland at an earlier period. *Ninia* or *Ninian*, was bishop of Whit-hern on the borders of Scotland, in the year 400; and his successors sometimes extended their labours as far north as Glasgow. Indeed *Kentigern* is said to have actually removed his chair from Whit-hern to Glasgow, before the arrival of *Columbas*, and to have invited this Irish missionary to visit him there. It was in the year 563 that *Columbas*, with twelve other monks, removed from the north of Ireland to *Iona*, *Hii*, I, or *I-calm-kill*, an islet on the outer shore of *Mull*, one of the larger of the Hebrides or Western isles. The Scottish king of Argyre, *Brude* or *Bride*, favoured his enterprise; and *Aulan*, a successor of *Brude*, paid him the highest reverence. *Columbas* had the sole jurisdiction of his little island,

which became covered with cloisters and churches, and was the residence of a numerous and learned body of monks. For several centuries *Iona* was the centre of the Scottish church, and the place where most of her clergy were educated. There also the Scottish kings, for many generations, were interred. *Columbas* died in the year 597. His memorable acts were recorded by *Cummeneus Albus*, (abbot of *Iona* from 657 to 669), and may be seen in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., tom. i., p. 342, &c., and his life at large, in iii. Books, was written by *Adamnanus*, who presided at *Iona* from 679 to 704. See *Usher*, Britannicar. Ecclesiar. Antiq., cap. xv., p. 687-709.—Tr.]

(8) *Henry Canisius*, Lectiones Antiquae, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 208. *Aventinus*, Annal. Boiorum; and others.

(9) As to the Franks, the Benedictine monks express themselves ingenuously; Histoire littéraire de la France, tome iii., Introd., p. 8, 11, 13. As to the Anglo-Saxons, see what *Gregory* the Great himself allowed of, Epistolar. lib. xi., ep. 76, Opp., tom. ii., p. 1176, ed. Benedictine. Among other things, he permitted the people on festival days, to offer to the saints such victims as they had before offered to their gods. *Dav. Wilkins*, Concilia Magnae Britan., tom. i., p. 18, &c.

(10) *Procopius*, de Aedificiis Justiniani, lib. vi., cap. 2.

(11) *Gregory* of Tours, Historia Francorum, lib. vi., c. 17. *Jo. Lannoi*, de veteri more baptizandi Judaeos et infideles, cap. i., in his Opp., tom. ii., pt. ii., p. 700,

§ 4. If credit were to be given to the writers of this age, these conversions of barbarous nations to Christianity must be ascribed principally to the prodigies and miracles that were wrought. But an inspection of the converted nations themselves, will forbid our believing so; for had these nations seen so many wonderful deeds with their own eyes, they would have had a stronger faith in Christianity, and would have more religiously obeyed its precepts. With the major part, the example and influence of their kings presented the chief argument for changing their religion. Nor were more solid reasons much needed; for the first preachers of Christianity among them, required of them nothing very difficult or crossing to their inclinations; they were only to worship the images of *Christ* and of holy men, instead of those of their gods, and for the most part with the same ceremonies; and to commit to memory certain Christian formulas. Some preachers moreover, as might easily be proved, deemed it lawful and right to delude the senses of the ignorant people, and to palm on them natural events for Divine interpositions.

CHAPTER II.

ADVERSE EVENTS AND OCCURRENCES.

§ 1. Pagans still remaining among the Christians.—§ 2. Writers opposed to Christianity.
—§ 3. Persecutions and Vexations.

§ 1. ALTHOUGH the imperial laws ordained, that no public office should be held by any one who would not abjure paganism, yet there were many learned and respectable men, who in the midst of the Christians followed the old religion. The illustrious compiler of the civil law, *Tribonianus*,⁽¹⁾

704. [All these Jewish conversions were a victory, which did the Christians little honour. *Avitus*, for instance, the bishop of Clermont, baptized 500 Jews. But the circumstances were these; a Jew, having voluntarily received baptism, was proceeding home in the customary white robe, when, meeting with other Jews, one of them poured some fetid oil on his white robe. The people soon kindled into a rage, and pulled down the synagogue; and the bishop sent word to the Jews, that they must all submit to be baptized, or must quit the place. In this dilemma, 500 preferred receiving baptism; and the rest removed to Marseilles. See *Gregory of Tours*, Hist. Francor., l. v., c. 11.—*Schl.*]

(12) See his Epistles, lib. i., ep. 47, in his Opp., tom. ii., p. 541. ed. Benedict., [or the extract from it in *Baronius*, Annal. ad ann. 591, tom. viii., p. 26, 27, ed. Antw., 1600. *Gregory* commends the intentions of the Gallic bishops, but thinks, that as

such converts seldom persevered, and therefore exposed themselves to a heavier punishment in the other world than if they had never been baptized, charity to them required that they should not be compelled to receive baptism.—*Tr.*]

(1) [*Tribonianus* was a native of Side in Pamphylia, flourished about A.D. 530, and died about A.D. 546. Richly furnished with Greek and Roman literature, he applied himself especially to the study of law. He was advanced to various civil offices, and was in favour with *Justinian*, on account of his eminent talents and his obsequiousness. The *Codex Justinianus* was the joint work of *Tribonianus* and others; but the compilation of the *Pandects* and *Institutes* was committed to him as chief, with others to assist him. *Tribonianus* was avaricious and irreligious. He has been accused of atheism and paganism. The truth probably was, that he had no fixed religious principles. See *J. H. Hermann*, Historia Juris Romani et Jus-

is thought by some, to have been averse from the Christian religion. Of *Procopius*,⁽²⁾ the celebrated and intelligent historian, the same suspicion is entertained by not a few. And it is still more certain that *Agathias*⁽³⁾ of Smyrna, an advocate at the bar, and also a historian, was an idolater. Indeed, as is commonly the case every where, the rigour of the laws fell only on those who had neither birth, nor wealth, nor the favour of the great to protect them.

§ 2. It is still more strange, that the Platonists who were universally known to be hostile to Christianity, should have been allowed publicly to instil their principles which were totally inconsistent with our religion, into the minds of the youth both in Greece and in Egypt. This class of men affected indeed a high degree of modesty, and for the most part, so qualified their language as to make the pagan idolatry appear not very remote from Christianity. This is evident from the examples of *Chalcidius*⁽⁴⁾ and *Alexander* of Lycopolis.⁽⁵⁾ Yet there were some among them who did not hesitate openly to attack the Christian religion. *Damascius*, in his life of his master *Isidore*, and elsewhere, casts many reproaches on the Christians.⁽⁶⁾ *Simplicius*, in his Expositions of Aristotle, not obscurely

tiniani, lib. ii., c. i., § 27, &c., and *Gibbon*, Decline and Fall, ch. xlv., vol. iv., p. 260, &c., ed. N. York, 1826.—*Tr.*]

(2) [*Procopius* of Cæsarea, (different from *Procopius* of Gaza), was a rhetorician, senator, and historian. He was secretary to the famous general *Belisarius*, from 533 to 542, during his campaigns in Asia, Africa, and Italy; and afterwards, being made a Roman senator, resided at Constantinople, and devoted himself to writing the civil history of his own times; viz., de Bello Persico, l. ii., de Bello Vandalico, l. ii., and de Bello Gothico, l. iv. His narration is elaborate and exact, and the style not unacceptable. He also wrote de Edificiis Justiniani, l. vi., in which he displays the munificence and greatness of that emperor: likewise Anecdota, sive Historia arcana, in which he describes the vices and crimes of *Justinian* and his Empress *Theodora*. *Procopius* was alive in the year 562. Some accuse him of leaning towards paganism. He was probably a man of no religion; but externally, a conformist to Christianity. His works were published, Gr. and Lat., by *C. Maltrel*, Paris, 1662, 2 vols. fol. See *Cave*, Historia Litteraria, tom. i., p. 510.—*Tr.*]

(3) [*Agathias*, an advocate at Smyrna, continued the history of *Procopius*, from the year 553 to A.D. 559, in five Books, written in an easy but florid style. He also wrote 80 epigrams. His works were published, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1660, fol. His history and that of *Procopius* are both in the Corpus Historiæ Byzantinæ Scriptorum, tom. ii., iii. See *Lardner*, Works, vol. ix., p. 85.—*Tr.*]

(4) Concerning the religion of *Chalcidius*, I have spoken in my notes on *R. Cudworth's*

Systema Intellectuale Universi, tom. i., p. 732. [*Chalcidius* flourished about A.D. 330, and wrote his Lat. translation of *Plato's* *Timæus*, with a Commentary, at the suggestion (as is reported) of *Hosius* of Corduba. Some make him to have been archdeacon of Carthage. See above, cent. iv., pt. i., § 18, with note (51), p. 225; and *Cave*, Hist. Lit., tom. i., p. 199.—*Tr.*]

(5) The treatise of this philosopher, *contra Manichæos*, in Greek, was published by *Fran. Combefis*, Auctarium Noviss. Biblioth. Patrum, tom. ii. Concerning his religion, *Is. de Brausobre* has given a critical dissertation, Histoire de Manichée et Manichéisme, pt. ii., Discours prelim., § 13, p. 236, &c. [*Alexander* of Lycopolis in Thebais, Egypt, flourished probably about A.D. 350. *Fabricius* supposes, (Biblioth. Gr., tom. v., p. 290), that he was first a pagan and a Manichee, and afterwards a Catholic Christian. *Cave* is of the same opinion (Hist. Lit., tom. ii., de Scriptor. incertæ ætatis). *Bcausobre* (ubi supra) thinks he was a mere pagan. *Lardner* (Works, vol. iii., p. 384, vol. viii., p. 349, &c.) thinks he was a gentile, but well acquainted with the Manichees and other Christians; and that he had some knowledge of the O. and N. Testaments, to which he occasionally refers. He speaks with respect of *Christ*, and the Christian philosophy; and appears to have been a learned and candid man.—*Tr.*]

(6) *Photius*, Bibliotheca, cod. cexlii., p. 1027. [*Damascius* was a native of *Damascus*, but studied and taught philosophy both at Athens and Alexandria. From the latter he fled to Persia, during the persecution of the pagan philosophers by the emperor *Justinian*, about the year 530. His subsequent

carps at the Christian faith.(7) The *Epicheiremata* xviii. contra Christianos, written by *Proclus*,(8) were in everybody's hands; and therefore received a confutation from *John Philoponus*.(9) So much license would not have been allowed to these men, had there not been among the magistrates many who were Christians in name and outward appearance rather than in reality.

§ 3. The Christians in several places had occasion, even in this century, to complain of the barbarity and cruelty of their enemies. During the greater part of it, the Anglo-Saxons who had seized upon Britain, brought every kind of calamity and suffering upon the former inhabitants of that country, who were Christians.(10) The *Huns* having made an irruption into Thrace, Greece, and other provinces, during the reign of *Justinian*, treated the Christians with cruelty;(11) yet they appear to have been influenced, not so much by a hatred of Christianity, as by hostility to the Greek empire. A great change in the state of Italy, took place about the middle of this century, under *Justinian* I. For this emperor, by *Narses* his general, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in that country, after it had stood ninety years, and annexed Italy to his empire. But under the emperor *Justin*, the Lombards, a very warlike German tribe under their king *Alboin*, accompanied by some other German nations, broke into Italy from Pannonia in the year 568; and having possessed themselves of the whole country, except Rome and Ravenna, founded a new kingdom at Pavia. Under these new lords, who were not only barbarians but averse from Christianity, the Italian Christians for a time endured immense evils and calamities. But the first rage of the conquerors gradually subsided, and the Lombards became more civilized. *Autharis*, their third king, made a profession of Christianity in the year 587; but he embraced the

history is unknown. He wrote the lives of *Isidorus* and others, Commentaries on *Plato*, and four books on extraordinary events: all of which are lost. *Photius* calls him *ἐὶς ἄκρον δυσσεβείας*, *superlatively irreligious*, (Codex clxxi.), and gives an epitome of his life of *Isidore*, Cod. ccxlii.—*Tr.*]

(7) [*Simplicius*, a native of Cilicia, a disciple of *Damascius*, and an eclectic philosopher, was one of those who fled into Persia, about the year 530. He returned a few years after, and wrote Commentaries on some of the philosophical and physical works of *Aristotle*; also a Commentary on the *Encheiridion* of *Epictetus*; both edited, Gr. and Lat., by *H. Wolf*, Leyden, 1640, 4to.—*Tr.*]

(8) [*Proclus* was born at Constantinople A.D. 410, studied at Alexandria and at Athens, and became head of the philosophical school in the latter place, in the year 450. He died A.D. 435. He was a man of much philosophical reading, a great enthusiast, a bold and whimsical speculator, and a most voluminous writer. His eighteen Arguments against the Christians, are so many proofs that the world was eternal. This work, with the confutation of *John Philoponus*, was

published in Greek, Venice, 1535, fol., and in Latin, Lyons, 1557, fol.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *J. A. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Gr.*, vol. iii., p. 522, &c., [and *Brucker*, *Historia crit. philos.*, tom. ii., p. 491, with *Hamberger's* zuverlässigen Nachrichten, tom. iii., p. 391.—*Schl.*]

(10) *Ja. Usher*, *Index Chronolog. Antiq. Eccles. Britan.*, ad ann. 508, p. 1123, [and still more to the purpose, ad ann. 511, p. 1125, and ad ann. 597, p. 1151, &c. At the beginning of this century, the Saxons held only Kent and Sussex, embracing about three counties in the southeast part of England; all the rest of the country was inhabited by Christian Britons. But during this century, the Saxons gradually extended their conquests; and before the century closed, the Britons were shut up among the mountains of Wales and Cornwall, except a few in Cumberland on the borders of Scotland, or were driven to take refuge beyond seas. Over all the rest of England paganism reigned: the churches were demolished or converted into idolatrous temples, and the public worship of the true God had ceased.—*Tr.*]

(11) *Procopius*, *de Bello Persico*, lib. ii., c. 4.

Arian creed. His successor however, *Agilulph*, was induced by his queen *Theodelinda*, to abandon the Arian sect, and join the Catholics of the Nicene creed.(12) But *Chosroes* the king of Persia, exceeded all others in barbarity; for he publicly declared that he would make war, not upon *Justinian*, but upon the God of the Christians; and he cut off an immense number of Christians by various modes of execution.(13)

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. The State of Learning in the West.—§ 2. The Sciences badly taught.—§ 3. The Study of Philosophy.—§ 4. State of Learning among the Greeks,—§ 5. and in the East.

§ 1. EVERY one knows, that the irruption of the fierce and barbarous nations into most of the provinces of the West, was extremely prejudicial to literature and to every species of learning. All the liberal arts and sciences would have become extinct, had they not found some feeble protection among the bishops and monks. To most of those churches which are called *cathedrals*, schools were annexed, in which either the bishop himself or some one appointed by him, instructed the youth in the seven liberal arts as a preparation for the study of the sacred books.(1) The monks and nuns were nearly all required by the founders of their houses, to devote some portion of every day to the reading of the works of the ancient fathers of the church, who were supposed to have exhausted the fountains of sacred knowledge.(2) It was therefore necessary that libraries should be formed in the monasteries, and that books should be multiplied by being transcribed. This labour of transcribing books was generally assigned to the more feeble-bodied monks, who were unable to encounter severe labour. To these establishments we owe the preservation of all the ancient authors that have come down to us, both sacred and profane. Moreover, in most of the monasteries schools were opened, in which the abbot or some one

(12) *Paulus Diaconus*, de gestis Longobardorum, l. ii., c. 2, and c. 27, p. 219, 231, ed. Lindenbrog. *Muratori*, Antiq. Italiae, tom. i., p. 14, tom. ii., p. 297, &c., and *Annales Italici*. *Giannone*, Histoire de Naples, [lib. iv., cap. 3], tom. i., p. 302, &c.
(13) *Procopius*, de Bello Persico, l. ii., c. 26.

(1) *Claude Fleury*, Discours sur l'Histoire ecclésiastique depuis l'an. 600, &c., § xxi., &c., in his Histoire Eccles., tome xiii., p. 56, [and among his Dissert. viii., in

Hist. Eccles., diss. iii., § 21, p. 205, &c. —Tr.] Histoire littéraire de la France, tome iii., Introd., § xxxii., p. 12, &c. *Herm. Conringius*, Antiquit. Academicæ, p. 66–167, ed. Heumann. [Gregory of Tours, lib. vi., c. 36.—Schl.]

(2) *Benedict* of Anian, Concordia Regularum, lib. ii., p. 55, 64, 75, 77, 80, 100, lib. iii., p. 16–41, &c., ed. *Hug. Menard*. *Jo. Mabillon*, Praef. ad Saecul. i., Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., p. xlv., &c.

of the monks instructed the children and youth that were devoted to a monastic life.(3)

§ 2. But, not to mention that many of the bishops and others who had control over the monks, were inattentive to their duty, and that others had prejudices against learning and science, which they apprehended to be hazardous to piety,—a fault commonly attributed to *Gregory* the Great, bishop of Rome, who, it is said, wished to have many of the ancient authors committed to the flames;(4)—not to mention also, that some of the bishops of set purpose, cultivated ignorance and barbarism, which they confounded with Christian simplicity;(5) to pass over these considerations, it remains to be stated, that the branches of learning taught in these schools were confined within very narrow limits;(6) and that the teachers were ignorant and incompetent. Greek literature was almost every where neglected: and those who professed to cultivate Latin, consumed their time on grammatical subtleties and niceties; as is manifest from the examples of *Isidorus* and *Cassiodorus*. Eloquence had degenerated into rhetorical blustering, with motley and frigid figures, and barbarous phraseology; as is shown by those who composed with most elegance, such as *Boëthius*, *Cassiodorus*, *Ennodius*, and others. The other liberal arts, as they called them, contained nothing elevated and liberal; but consisted of only a few precepts, and those very dry.

§ 3. Philosophy was wholly excluded from the schools which were under the direction of the clergy, for nearly all supposed that religious persons could do very well without it, or rather ought never to meddle with it.

(3) *Benedict*, Concordia Regular., lib. ii., p. 232. *Joh. Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., tom. i., p. 314, &c. [And yet it is certain, that these monkish schools kept aloof from the sources of real learning, I mean the ancient classic authors; and that the best interpreters of scripture among the fathers, such as *Origen* and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, were left to moulder in the dust. On the contrary, the young monks were occupied with reading and transcribing the most silly fables and legends, by which their understandings and their imaginations were injured past recovery. In the Rule of *Isidore*, it is expressly stated: *Libros gentilium et hæreticorum legere nefas*.—*Schl.*]

(4) *Gabr. Liron*, Singularités historiques et litter., tome i., p. 166, &c. [That *Gregory* was opposed to all secular learning, appears incontrovertibly, from his conduct towards *Desiderius* bishop of Vienne. This bishop was a man of great merit, virtues, and learning. But he instructed some of his friends in grammar and the fine arts, and read with them the pagan poets. *Gregory* looked upon all this as horrible wickedness; and therefore hesitated about sending him the pall, and reproved him very sharply in an epistle which is still extant. (*Gregory*, Epist., lib. ix., ep. 48.) “Because (says the honest pope, who esteemed it no wrong to praise extravagantly the greatest villains

and the cruellest murderers), the praises of *Christ* and those of *Jupiter* cannot have place in the same mouth. And consider, how enormous a crime it is for a bishop to sing! which would be unbecoming even in a religious layman. The more horrible this is in a priest, the more earnestly and faithfully should it be inquired into.—If it should hereafter appear clearly, that the reports which have reached me are false, and that you do not study vanities and secular literature (*nec vos nugis et secularibus literis studere*), I shall praise God, who has not permitted your heart to be defiled with the blasphemous praises of abominable deities.”—But whether it be true, as *John* of Salisbury states, (*de Nugis Curialium*, lib. ii., c. 26, and lib. viii., c. 19), that he caused the Palatine or Capitoline library to be burned; or as *Antoninus* of Florence tells us, (see *Vossius* de Historicis Latinis, p. 98), that he committed to the flames *Livy’s* History; must be considered uncertain, as the witnesses are so modern. Yet it would not be improbable, in a man of such flaming zeal against the pagan writers.—*Schl.*]

(5) *Jo. Mabillon*, Præf. ad Saecul. i. [Actor. Sanctor. ordinis] Benedicti, p. xlv.

(6) See *Marcus Aurelius Cassiodorus*, de septem Disciplinis Liber; among his Works.

The most eminent, and indeed almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated *Boëthius*, privy counsellor to *Theodoric* king of the Ostrogoths in Italy. He embraced the *Platonic* system;(7) but like most of the younger Platonists, approved also the precepts of *Aristotle*, and illustrated them by his writings. He is therefore not improperly regarded as the man, whose labours brought the Aristotelian philosophy into higher repute among the Latins than it had before been.

§ 4. Among the Greeks, the liberal arts were cultivated in several places with more zeal, and some of the emperors encouraged all branches of learning with honours and liberal rewards;(8) yet the number of the men of genius appears much smaller than in the preceding century. When this century commenced, the younger *Platonism* was flourishing in full splendour. The schools of Alexandria and Athens were under masters of high reputation, *Damascius*, *Isidore*,(9) *Simplicius*, *Eulapius*, *Hermias*, *Priscian*, and others. But when the emperor *Justinian* forbid by an express law the teaching of philosophy at Athens,(10) (which is undoubtedly to be understood of this species of philosophy), and also manifested peculiar displeasure against those who would not renounce idolatry, all these philosophers removed and took residence among the Persians, the enemies of the Romans.(11) They indeed returned afterwards, on the restoration of peace between the Persians and the Romans in the year 533;(12) but they were never able to recover their former credit, and they gradually ceased to keep up their schools. Such was the termination of this sect, which had been a most troublesome one to the church for many centuries. On the contrary, the *Aristotelian* philosophy gradually emerged from its obscurity, and received elucidation especially from the commentaries of *John Philoponus*. And it became necessary for the Greeks to acquaint themselves with it, because the *Monophysites* and the *Nestorians* endeavoured to confute the adherents to the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, by arguments suggested by this philosophy.

§ 5. For the *Nestorians* as well as the *Monophysites*, living in the East, kept their eye upon *Aristotle*, and, to enable their adherents to be good disputants, translated his principal works out of Greek into their vernacular tongues. Into the Syriac language, *Sergius* Rasainensis, a Monophysite

(7) This will be evident to any one who, with some knowledge of the views of the younger Platonists, takes up his Books de Consolatione philosophiae. See also *Renat. Vallinus*, Notes, p. 10, 50. *Luc. Holstenius*, de Vita Porphyrii, p. 7, ed. Cantabr.; likewise, *Jo. Jas. Moscov*, Historia Germanorum, tom. ii., p. 102, &c. [*Brucker*, Historia crit. Philos., tom. iii., p. 524, &c., and *Hamberger's* zuverlässige Nachrichten, vol. iii., p. 317, &c.—*Schl.*]

(8) See the Codex Theodos., tom. ii., lib. vi., p. 113, &c. *Herm. Conringius*, de Studiis urbis Romae et Constantinop., annexed to his Diss. de Antiquit. Academicis.

(9) [See *Brucker's* account of *Isidore* in his Historia crit. Philos., tom. ii., p. 341. *Isidore* was called *Gaza*, from his native place, Gaza in Palestine; and this discrim-

inated him from *Isidore* Mercator, Hispalensis, and Peleusiota.—*Schl.*]

(10) *Johannes Malala*, Historia Chronica, pt. ii., p. 187, ed. Oxon. Another testimony to the same point, derived from I know not what unpublished *Chronicon*, is adduced by *Nicol. Alemannus*, ad *Procopii* Historiam arcanam, cap. 26, p. 377, ed. Venetae. [Also *Agathias*, cap. 2, and *Suidas*, Article *προσβῆς*, tom. iii., p. 171, seem to refer to this event, by saying: *Damascius*, *Simplicius*, *Eulapius*, *Priscianus*, *Hermias*, *Diogenes*, and *Isidorus*, retired to Persia, because they could not live according to their inclinations.—*Schl.*]

(11) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, l. ii. Corpus Byzant., tom. iii., p. 49, ed. Venetae.

(12) Consult the excellent *Peter Wesselingius*, Observat. variar., lib. i., c. 18, p. 117.

and a philosopher, translated the writings of Aristotle.(13) In Persia, one *Uranius* a Syrian, propagated his doctrines; and even instilled them into the mind of *Chosroes* the king, who was studious of such matters.(14) Another who was doubtless of the Nestorian sect, (for no other in this age prevailed in Persia, the Greeks being excluded), presented the same king with a Persian translation of *Aristotle*.(15) Yet there were among these Christians, some who rejecting both *Plato* and *Aristotle*, chose to philosophize or speculate according as their own genius led them. Such was the Nestorian *Cosmas*, called *Indicopleustes*; whose opinions were quite peculiar, and more consentaneous with those of the Orientals, than with those of the Greeks.(16) Such also was the writer, from whose Exposition of the Octateuch *Photius* has preserved some extracts.(17)

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Contests between the Bishops of Constantinople and Rome.—§ 2. Endeavours of the latter to obtain Supreme Power.—§ 3, 4. Corrupt Lives of the Clergy.—§ 5. The Monks.—§ 6. Order of Benedict.—§ 7. Its Propagation.—§ 8. Principal Authors among the Greeks.—§ 9. Latin Writers.

§ 1. In the constitution of the Christian church there was no important change. But the two prelates who considered themselves and were regarded by others as standing at the head of the whole church, the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, were incessantly contending for priority, and about the extent of their territories and jurisdiction. The bishop of Constantinople not only claimed the primacy in the eastern churches, but maintained that his see was in no respect inferior to that of Rome. But

(13) *Georgius Abulpharajus*, *Historia Dynastiar.*, p. 94, 172, ed. of *Pocock*.

(14) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, lib. ii., p. 48. That this *Uranius* applied the precepts of *Aristotle* to the Eutychian controversies, appears from this, that *Agathias* represents him as disputing about the *possibility and immiscibility* of God, *καὶ τὸ παν-ητὸν καὶ ἀξύγχρονον*. [*Uranius* was in so high esteem with king *Chosroes*, that he had him constantly at his table. He wished to be accounted a skeptic; but he may more justly be ranked among the Nestorians, than among the proper philosophers.—*Schl.*]

(15) *Agathias*, de Rebus Justiniani, lib. ii., p. 48, ed. Venetææ.

(16) *Bern. de Montfaucon*, *Praef. ad Cosmam*, p. x., &c., in his *Collectio Nov. Patr. Graecorum*, tom. ii. [This *Cosmas* was an Egyptian monk. In early life he was a merchant, and drove a traffic through the whole length of the Red Sea, and quite to India:

whence he got the name of *Indicopleustes*, an *India Navigator*. After many years spent in this manner, he took up residence in a monastery in Egypt, and devoted himself to composing books. His chief work is *Topographia Christiana, sive Christianorum opinio de mundo*, in xii. Books. It is his great aim to prove the earth not spherical, but a vast oblong plain; the length east and west, being double the breadth. He argues from scripture, reason, testimony, and the authority of the fathers. But while pressing his main point, he introduces much valuable geographical information, which he had collected in his voyages. He flourished, and probably wrote, about A.D. 535. The best edition is that of *Montfaucon*, Gr. and Lat., in *Collect. Nov. Patr. Gr.*, tom. ii., Paris, 1706. See *Cave's Historia Litteraria*, tom. i., p. 515, &c.—*Tr.*]

(17) *Photius*, *Biblioth. Cod.*, xxxvi., p. 22, 23.

the pontiffs of Rome were exceedingly disturbed at this, and contended that *their* see held a rank and pre-eminence above that of Constantinople. In particular, the Roman pontiff *Gregory* the Great, did so in the year 587; when *John* of Constantinople, surnamed the *Faster* on account of the austerity of his life, had by his own authority assembled a council of eastern bishops at Constantinople to decide on charges brought against *Peter* [*Gregory*] bishop of Antioch, and on this occasion had arrogated to himself the title of *œcumenical* or *universal bishop*.(1) For although the bishops of Constantinople had long used this title, which was capable of a harmless interpretation, yet *Gregory* concluded from the time and the occasion on which it was now used, that *John* was aiming at a supremacy over all Christian churches; and he therefore wrote letters to the emperor and to others, in which he vehemently inveighed against this title. But he could effect nothing; and the bishops of Constantinople continued to assume it, though not in the sense which *Gregory* supposed.(2)

§ 2. Persevering in his opposition, the bishop of Rome excited commotion everywhere, in order to bring the Christian world under his own control. And he was in some degree successful, especially in the West; but in the East, scarcely any would listen to him, unless actuated by hostility to the bishop of Constantinople; and this last was always in a condition to oppose his ambitious designs in that quarter. How greatly the ideas of many had advanced respecting the powers of the bishop of Rome, cannot better be shown than by the Example of *Ennodius*, the insane flatterer of *Symmachus*; who, among other extravagant expressions, said, *the pontiff judges in the place of God*, vice Dei judicare.(3) But on the other hand, there are numerous proofs, that the emperors as well as some whole

(1) [*Dr. Mosheim* here confounds dates, names, and transactions. *Gregory* (not *Peter*) bishop of Antioch, being accused of incest and other crimes, appealed from the tribunal of the governor of the East to the emperor *Mauricius*; and the emperor (not the patriarch *John*) called a council, or appointed a court of Commissioners at Constantinople in 587, composed of patriarchs, (or their delegates), Roman senators, and metropolitans, to hear and decide the case. (See *Evagrius*, Hist. Eccles., l. vi., c. 7. *Evagrius* was himself *Gregory's* counsellor at the trial, and has given us nearly all the information which has reached us respecting this council.) On this occasion, it is said, *John* the patriarch of Constantinople, was honoured with the title of *universal bishop*,—a title which had for some time been used by the bishops of that see. The decisions of this council being sent to *Pelagius* II., (not to *Gregory* the Great), bishop of Rome, *Pelagius* confirmed the acquittal of *Gregory* of Antioch, but remonstrated strongly against the title given to *John*. His letters on the occasion are lost, but they are mentioned by his successor. In the year 590, *Pelagius* died, and was succeeded by *Gregory* the Great; and he, finding that *John* continued

to use this title, took up the business in earnest about the year 595, and for some years laboured by entreaties and threats, and continued applications to the emperors and to the other eastern patriarchs, to divest the Constantinopolitan patriarchs of a title which he maintained to be *profane*, *Antichristian*, and *infernal*, by whomsoever assumed. See *Gregory* the Great, Epistolar. lib. iv., ep. 36, 38, and lib. vii., ep. 69. *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (*Pelagius* II.), vol. ii., p. 459, and (*Gregory*) vol. ii., p. 505, 511, 517, ed. Lond., 1750. *Natalis Alexander*, Hist. Eccles., Sæcul. vi., cap. ii., art. 12, 13, tom. x., p. 18, 25, &c., ed. Paris, 1743. —Tr.]

(2) *Gregory* the Great, Epistolar. lib. iv., v., vii. All the passages in these epistles, relating to this important subject, are collected and illustrated by *Jo. Launoï*, Assertio in privilegium S. Medardi, Opp., tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 266, &c. See *Mich. le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. i., p. 67, &c. *Chr. Matth. Pfaff*, Diss. de titulo Œcumenicus; in the Tempe Helvetica, tom. iv., p. 99, and the authors there mentioned.

(3) See his Apologeticum pro Synodo, in the Biblioth. mag. Patr., tom. xv., p. 248, ed. Paris.

nations, would not patiently bear this new yoke.(4) The Gothic kings in Italy, would not allow the bishop of Rome to domineer excessively there; nor would they allow any one to be considered as pontiff, whom they had not approved; and they wished to have his election controlled by their decisions.(5) These kings also enacted laws relative to religious matters, arraigned the clergy before their tribunals, and summoned ecclesiastical councils.(6) And the pontiffs themselves paid homage to these sovereigns, and afterwards to the emperors, in a submissive manner; for they had not yet become so lost to all shame, as to look upon temporal sovereigns as their vassals.(7)

§ 3. The clergy were previously in possession of high privileges, and great wealth; and the superstition of this century added considerably to both. For it was supposed, that sins might be expiated by munificence to churches and to monks; and that the prayers of departed saints, which were most efficacious with God, might be purchased, by presents offered to them and by temples dedicated to their names.(8) This increase of wealth and privileges was accompanied with an equal increase of the vices usually attendant on affluence, in the clergy of all ranks from the highest to the lowest;(9) as is manifest even from the laws enacted by councils and by the emperors to regulate the lives and morals of the clergy.(10) For what need was there of guarding the morals of these men with such ramparts of laws, if they exhibited some degree of love

(4) See, particularly respecting Spain, *Mich. Geddes*, On the Papal supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spanish church; published among his Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii., p. 1, &c.

(5) See *Joh. Ja. Mascov*, *Historia Germanorum*, tom. ii., note, p. 113.

(6) *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i., p. 381, &c. [Thus, e. g., *Theodoric* assembled the Italian bishops at Rome, to settle the contested election of *Symmachus* to the papal chair. (*Walch*, *Histoire der Kirchenversamml.*, p. 347.) The council of Orleans, in 511, was held by order of *Clovis*, (*ibid.*, p. 351.) Another at Orleans in 533, by order of *Childebert*, (*ibid.*, p. 367.) And in the year 549, (*ibid.*, p. 375.) And at Clermont, by order of *Theudebert*, (*ibid.*, p. 368.)—*Schl.*]

(7) See the collections from *Gregory* the Great, by *Jo. Launoï*, de Regia potestate in matrimon., *Opp.*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 691, &c., and *Assertio in privilegium S. Medardi*, *Opp.*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 275. *Giannone*, *Histoire de Naples*, tom. ii., p. 282, &c.; [and lib. iii., cap. vi., § 6.—*Tr.*]

(8) [Thus, e. g., *Gregory* (in cap. xv. *Jobi*, l. xii., c. 23) says: "Whenever, after committing a crime we give alms, we do as it were compensate for our wicked actions." So also in his *Epistles* (lib. ix., ep. 38): "The intercessions in heaven of him, whose body you have covered on earth, will protect you from all sins," &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) [*Theophanes*, (on the second year of

Justinian's reign), states that *Esaias* bishop of Rhodes, and *Alexander* bishop of Diospolis in Thrace, were for the crime of sodomy deprived of their offices and castrated by order of the emperor, and then carried about as a show, with a herald proclaiming: "All ye bishops, beware of disgracing your venerable office." So in the epistles of *Gregory* the Great, many proofs occur of impure conduct among the clergy: e. g., l. viii., ep. 11; l. iii., ep. 26 and 9; l. i., ep. 18, 42.—*Schl.*]

(10) [Thus, e. g., in the council of Agde in Gaul, (can. 41), it was enacted, that a clergyman who should get drunk, should be excluded the church for 30 days, or undergo corporeal punishment: and (can. 42) the clergy were forbidden to exercise the art of fortune-telling. *Harduin's* *Concilia*, tom. ii., p. 1002. Other laws forbid simony, concubinage, perjury, usury, and gaudy dress, in the clergy. In *Harduin's* *Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 529, mention is made of many nuns, at the head of whom were two princesses, *Chrotildis* and *Basine*, who broke from the nunnery at Poitiers, and who were a part of them found pregnant, and also committed the most shameful acts of violence. And in page 531, he mentions one *Aegidius* bishop of Rheims, who used forged documents before the council of Metz; and for treasonable practices, was removed from office. See *Fleury*, *Ecclesiast. History*; the German translation, vol. v., p. 413, 417, lib. xxxv., § 5-8.—*Schl.*]

for virtue and piety? Yet the efficacy of these laws was slight; for so great was the reverence for the clergy, that their most atrocious offences were visited with the gentlest chastisements; and this imboldened them to perpetrate any iniquity.

§ 4. What sort of men the bishops of Rome were, who wished to be thought the chiefs and fathers of the whole Christian church, and also the body of the clergy under them at Rome, best appears from the long and violent contest between *Symmachus* and *Laurentius*, which broke out in the year 498, and was at length settled by the Gothic king *Theodoric*. Each maintained, that himself was the regularly-constituted pontiff; and each accused the other of the most abominable crimes, and not without an appearance of truth. Three councils assembled at Rome, were not able to terminate the dreadful quarrel; in the fourth, soon after the commencement of the century, *Theodoric* having taken up the business, *Symmachus* was at length pronounced innocent. But the adverse party continued to deny that justice had been done *them* by this decision; and this led *Ennodius* of Pavia to write his *Apology for the council and for Symmachus*.⁽¹¹⁾ From this treatise, which abounds in rhetorical colouring, we may clearly learn, that the foundations of that exorbitant power which the pontiffs afterwards obtained, were already laid; but not that *Symmachus* had been inconsiderately and unjustly accused.

§ 5. The progress of monkery was very great, both in the East and in the West. In the East, whole armies of monks might have been en-

(11) This Apology is extant in the Biblioth. Magn. Patr., tom. xv., p. 248, &c., [and in most of the Collections of Councils.—This contest may be worth describing more fully.—On the death of the pontiff *Athanasius* in the year 498, not only the clergy, but the people and the senate of Rome, were divided about a successor. *Symmachus* a deacon, and *Laurentius* the archpresbyter, were both chosen on the same day by their respective partisans; and so eager were both parties to carry their point, that the whole city was in an uproar, and many battles and much bloodshed took place in the streets and in the public places. To end the dire contest, the leading men on both sides agreed to refer the contested point to the decision of *Theodoric*, the Arian king resident at Ravenna. He decided, that the one who should be found to have had most votes, and to have been elected at the earliest hour, should be considered the legal pontiff. This secured the election of *Symmachus*. The king likewise ordered the bishops to make regulations for the election of future popes, which should prevent the recurrence of similar difficulties. This was done in the year 499. But the party of *Laurentius* were not yet quiet. In the year 500, they accused *Symmachus* of several heinous crimes before the king; and the tumults and civil wars of Rome were renewed, with increased violence. Some senators informed

the king of the state of Rome, and requested him to send a Visitor to Rome, with full power to settle all the difficulties. *Peter*, bishop of Altino, was appointed. He repaired to Rome, and at once suspended *Symmachus*, and took the goods of the church into his own hands. This enraged the partisans of *Symmachus* to madness, and prostrated all order and subordination. Being apprized of the state of things, the king now repaired to Rome in person, and spent six months in tranquillizing that distracted city. He ordered all the bishops of Italy to meet in council, and decide on the charges against *Symmachus*. The council held several meetings in that and the following years. *Symmachus*, when sent for, set out to go to the council, attended by a mob; a battle ensued in the streets; several were killed; *Symmachus* himself was wounded, turned back, and refused to appear before the council. The council, after some delay, proceeded in his absence; decreed that the witnesses being slaves, were incompetent to prove any thing; and therefore dismissed the complaint. The friends of *Laurentius* protested against the decision. The council met again, and adopted as their own the apology for them drawn up by *Ennodius*. See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Symmachus*), vol. ii., p. 248–261, ed. Lond., 1750. *Harduin*, Concilia, tom. ii., p. 961, &c., 975, 983, 989.—*Tr.*]

rolled, without a sensible diminution of the number any where. In the West, this mode of life found patrons and followers almost without number, in all the provinces: as may appear from the various rules, drawn up by different individuals, for regulating the lives of monks and nuns.(12) In Great Britain, one *Congal* is said to have persuaded an immense number to abandon active life and spend their days in solitude, according to a rule which he prescribed.(13) His disciples filled Ireland, Gaul, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries, with convents of monks. The most famous of them was *Columbanus*, who has left us a rule of his own, distinguished for its simplicity and brevity.(14) The whole monastic order abounded with fanatics and profligates. But in the Oriental monasteries, there were more fanatics than knaves; while in the occidental the knaves outnumbered the fanatics.

§ 6. A new order of monks, which in time absorbed all the others in the West, was established at Mount *Cassino* in the year 529, by *Benedict* of Nursia, a devout and a distinguished man according to the standard of that age. His *Rule* is still extant; and it shows that it was not his aim to bring all monks under his regulations, but rather to found a new society, more stable, of better morals, and living under milder rules than the other monks, the members of which should lead a retired and holy life, employed in prayers, reading, manual labour, and the instruction of youth.(15) But his followers departed widely from the princi-

(12) Most of these Rules are extant, in *Lu. Holstein's Codex Regularum*, pt. ii., published at Rome, 1661, in 3 vols. 4to. Add *Edm. Martene* and *Ursin. Durand*, *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, tom. i., p. 4.

(13) *Ja. Usher*, *Antiq. Eccles. Britan.*, p. 132, 441, 911. [*Comgallus* or *Congellus*, was an Irish monk, who founded several monasteries; the most important of which was that of *Banehor* or *Bangor*, (on the south shore of *Carrickfergus* Bay, in the northeasterly part of Ireland), erected about A.D. 530. *Congal* is said to have ruled over 3000 monks, living in different monasteries and cells. See *Usher*, loc. cit.—*Tr.*]

(14) *Ja. Usher*, *Sylloge antiquar. Epistolar. Hibernicarum*, p. 5–15. *Lu. Holstein*, *Codex Regular.*, tom. ii., p. 48, &c. *Maillon*, *Praef. ad Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.*, Saecl. ii., p. iv. [*St. Columbanus*, (a different person from *Columbus* the apostle of Scotland, mentioned p. 381, supra), was born in *Leinster*, Ireland, about the year 559. After a good education in the literature of that age, he became a monk, in the monastery of *Bangor*, under *Congal*. In the year 589, with 12 companions, he passed through England into Gaul; and settled in Burgundy, where he built the monastery of *Luxuel*, or *Luxorium*; and there spent about 20 years, with great reputation. But in the year 610, having offended *Theodoric* the king, by reproving his vices, he was banished that territory; and after wandering a few years in different parts of Gaul and Germany

along the Rhine, and spending three years near *Bregentz* in Helvetia, he went into Italy; was received kindly by *Agilulph* the Lombard king, built the monastery of *Bobio* near Pavia, presided over it one year, and then died, about A.D. 615. He was a man of superior genius, and possessed vast influence. His works yet remaining, are his monastic rule; his monastic discipline; some poems and epistles; and 17 discourses; all which were published at *Louvain* in 1667, by *Patrick Fleming*, an Irish monk. His life, written by *Jonas*, an abbot of Bobium, while several contemporaries of *Columbanus* were yet living, is extant in *Maillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.*, tom. ii., p. 2–26.—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Jo. Maillon*, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.*, tom. i., and *Annales Ord. Benedict.*, tom. i. *Helvyot* [*Histoire des Ordres monastiques religieux et militaires*, &c., in 8 vols. 4to, Paris, 1714–19], and the other historians of the monastic orders.—[*Benedict* was born of reputable parents, at *Nursia* in Italy, A.D. 480. At the age of fourteen, he was sent to Rome for education; but, disgusted with the dissipations of the city and the school, he soon ran away, and concealed himself three years in a cave, at *Sublacum* about 40 miles from Rome. At length he was discovered, and his cell became much frequented. He was now chosen abbot of a monastery in the vicinity; but the rigour of his discipline gave offence, and he relinquished the office, and returned to

ples of their founder ; for, after they had acquired immense riches by the liberality of princes and pious individuals, they gave themselves up to lux-

Sublacum, where he continued till about the year 529. Many monks here joined him, and he had 12 cells, each containing 12 monks, under *his* jurisdiction. Many of the first Roman families placed their sons under his instruction ; and his reputation for piety and for miracles procured him almost unbounded respect. But his fame excited the envy of some clergymen, and led to plots against his life. After 25 years spent at Sublacum, he retired to Mount *Cassino*, about 50 miles south of Sublacum and about as far from Naples. Here he converted a body of pagan mountaineers, and turned their temple into a monastery, in which he spent the remainder of his days in quietude and honour. He died about A.D. 543. His life was written by Pope *Gregory* the Great, and constitutes the second Book of his *Dialogue* : it is also inserted in *Mabillon's Acta Sanctorum*. Ord. Ben., tom. i., p. 1-25.—According to the *Rule* of Benedict, the monks were to rise at two A.M. in winter, (and in summer, at such hours as the abbot might direct), repair to the place of worship, for vigils ; and then spend the remainder of the night in committing psalms, private meditation, and reading. At sunrise they assembled for matins ; then spent four hours in labour ; then two hours in reading ; then dined, and read in private till half past two P.M., when they met again for worship ; and afterwards laboured till their vespers. In their vigils and matins, 24 Psalms were to be chanted each day ; so as to complete the Psalter every week. Besides their social worship, seven hours each day were devoted to labour, two at least to private study, one to private meditation, and the rest to meals, sleep, and refreshment. The labour was agriculture, gardening, and various mechanical trades ; and each one was put to such labour as his superior saw fit ; for they all renounced wholly every species of personal liberty. They ate twice a day, at a common table ; first, about noon, and then at evening. Both the quantity and the quality of their food were limited. To each was allowed one pound of bread per day, and a small quantity of wine. On the public table no meat was allowed, but always two kinds of porridge. To the sick, flesh was allowed. While at table, all conversation was prohibited ; and some one read aloud the whole time. They all served as cooks and waiters by turns, of a week each. Their clothing was coarse and simple, and regulated at the discretion of the abbot. Each was provided with two suits, a knife, a needle, and all other necessities. They

slept in common dormitories of 10 or 20, in separate beds, without undressing, and had a light burning, and an inspector sleeping in each dormitory. They were allowed no conversation after they retired, nor at any time were they permitted to jest, or to talk for mere amusement. No one could receive a present of any kind, not even from a parent ; nor have any correspondence with persons without the monastery, except by its passing under the inspection of the abbot. A porter always sat at the gate, which was kept locked day and night ; and no stranger was admitted without leave from the abbot ; and no monk could go out, unless he had permission from the same source. The school for the children of the neighbourhood was kept without the walls. The whole establishment was under an abbot, whose power was despotic. His under officers were, a prior or deputy, a steward, a superintendent of the sick and the hospital, an attendant on visitors, a porter, &c., with the necessary assistants, and a number of deans or inspectors over tens, who attended the monks at all times. The abbot was elected by the common suffrage of the brotherhood ; and when inaugurated, he appointed and removed his under officers at pleasure. On great emergencies, he summoned the whole brotherhood to meet in council ; and on more common occasions, only the seniors ; but in either case, after hearing what each one was pleased to say, the decision rested wholly with himself. For admission to the society, a probation of 12 months was required ; during which the applicant was fed and clothed, and employed in the meaner offices of the monks, and closely watched. At the end of his probation, if approved, he took solemn and irrevocable vows of perfect chastity, absolute poverty, and implicit obedience to his superiors in every thing. If he had property, he must give it all away, either to his friends or the poor, or to the monastery ; and never after must possess the least particle of private property, nor claim any personal rights or liberties. For lighter offences, a reprimand was to be administered by some under officer. For greater offences, after two admonitions, a person was debarred his privileges, not allowed to read in his turn, or to sit at table, or enjoy his modicum of comforts. If still refractory, he was expelled the monastery ; yet might be restored on repentance. See the *Rule*, at large, in *Hospinian*, Opp., tom. iv., (de Monachis, libri vii.), p. 202-222, ed. Genev., 1669, fol., and as abridged by *Fleury*, *Histoire Eccles.*, lib. xxxii., §

ury, idleness, and every vice, became involved in civil affairs and the cabals of courts, were intent on multiplying vain and superstitious rites, and most eager to advance the authority and power of the Roman pontiffs. None of these things were enjoined or permitted by *St. Benedict*; whose Rule, though still highly extolled, has for many ages ceased to be observed.(16) Yet the institution of *Benedict* changed the state of monkery in the West, in various respects; not the least important of which was, that the *application* and *profession* made by the monks, bound them *for ever* to observe his rules; whereas previously, the monks changed the rule and regulations of their founders at pleasure.(17)

§ 7. Only a short time elapsed, before this new order of monks was in a most flourishing state in all the western countries. In Gaul, it was propagated by *St. Maurus*, in Sicily and Sardinia, by *Placidus* and others; in England, by *Augustine* and *Mellitus*; in Italy and in other parts, by *Gregory* the Great, who is reported to have lived some time in this order.(18)

14–19. Yet it is questionable whether the Rule as there laid down was precisely what *Benedict* prescribed.—*Tr*]

(16) [The modern Benedictines are themselves obliged to admit, that the Rule of their founder is no longer fully obeyed. But they resort to a convenient distinction. The Rule, say they, has its *essential* and its *accidental* parts. That the monks should labour, earn their own bread, and live frugally, belongs to the accidental part. The essential parts are the *vows*; which we observe religiously, a few faults excepted. We admit freely, that the order is richer than in the days of its founder. Father *Benedict* would be amazed, should he rise out of his grave, and instead of the miserable huts which he erected on Mount Cassino, find there a palace, in which kings and princes might reside; and see the abbot transformed into a prince of the empire, with a multitude of subjects, and an income of five or six hundred thousand ducats.—*Schl.*]

(17) See *Mabillon*, *Praef. ad Saecul. iv.*, p. i., [Actor. *Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.*, tom. v.], p. xviii., &c. [*Benedict* changed the state of monkery by restraining the instability of the monks, and rendering their vows irrevocable. It was not strange that the order spread far and wide. His *Rule* was better calculated than any other for Europeans, and the first Benedictines were virtuous, upright, and useful people. Wherever they came, they converted the wilderness into a cultivated country; they pursued the breeding of cattle and agriculture, laboured with their own hands, drained morasses, and cleared away forests. These monks—taking the word *Benedictines* in its largest extent, as embracing the ramifications of the order, the Carthusians, Cistersians, Praemonstratensians, Camaldulensians, &c.—were of great advantage to all Europe, and particu-

larly to Germany. By them Germany was cultivated and rendered a fruitful country. They preserved for us all the books of antiquity, all the sciences and learning of the ancients. For they were obliged to have libraries in their monasteries, because their rule required them to read during a portion of each day. Some individuals were occupied in transcribing the books of the ancients; and hence came the manuscripts, which still exist here and there in the libraries of monasteries. The sciences were cultivated nowhere but in their cloisters. They kept up schools there for the monks, and for such as were destined to be monks. And without their cloisters they also had schools, in which the people of the world were instructed. From these monasteries proceeded men of learning, who were employed in courts as chancellors, vice-chancellors, secretaries, &c., and these again patronised the monasteries. Even the children of sovereign princes were brought up among the Benedictines, and after they came to their thrones retained attachment and reverence for the order, to whom they were indebted for their education. The Benedictines were esteemed *saints*, and their prayers were supposed to be particularly efficacious. All this rendered the order powerful and rich. But as soon as they became rich, they became voluptuous and indolent, and their cloisters were haunts of vice and wickedness. In the seventeenth century, this order began to revert back to its original design, especially in France; and it performed essential service to the republic of learning, in particular by publishing beautiful editions of the Fathers.—*Schl.*]

(18) See *Jo. Mabillon*, *Diss. de vita monastica Gregorii Magni*; annexed to *Hadr. Valerius*, *Analect. veter.*, tom. ii., and *Mabillon's Praef. ad Saecul. i.*, [Actor. *Sanctor.*

In Germany, *Boniface* afterwards caused it to be received.(19) This rapid progress of their order, the Benedictines ascribe to the miracles of *St. Benedict* and his disciples, and to the holiness and superiority of the rules which he prescribed. But those who more critically examine the causes of events, have very nearly all united in the opinion, that the favour shown them by the Roman pontiffs, to whose glory and exaltation this whole order was especially devoted, contributed more than all other causes to its wide extension and grandeur. Yet it was not till the ninth century that all other rules and societies became extinct, and the Benedictines alone reigned.(20)

§ 8. Among the Greek and Oriental Christians, the most distinguished writers of this century were the following: *Procopius* of Gaza, who expounded some books of the Bible not unhappily.(21) *John Maxentius*, a monk of Antioch, who, besides some books against the sects of his times, wrote *Scholia on Dionysius Areopagita*.(22) *Agapetus* procured himself a place among the wise men of the age, by his *Scheda Regia*, addressed to the emperor *Justinian*.(23) *Eulogius*, a presbyter of Antioch, was ardent

Ord.] Benedict., p. xxix., &c. Yet some deny this, as *Anton. Gallonius*, [de Monachatu Gregorii, &c.], on whose book, see *Rich. Simon*, *Lettres choisies*, tom. iii., p. 63. [Yet the monkery of *Gregory the Great*, after the investigations of *Mabilton*, seems no longer liable to doubt. He established six monasteries in Sicily, and assigned them out of his great riches as much landed estate as was necessary for their support. A seventh monastery he founded at Rome, in his own house, dedicated to *St. Andrew*; which still exists, and is in the hands of the Camaldulensians. See *Fleury*, *Histoire Eccles.*, liv. xxxiv., § 34.—*Schl.*]

(19) *Anton. Dandini Attersera*, *Origines rei monasticæ*, lib. i., cap. 9, p. 33. On the propagation of the Benedictine Rule in the various countries of Europe, *Jo. Mabilton* has a particular treatise, *Praef. ad Saecul. i.*, [Actor. Sanctor. Ord.] Benedict., and *Praef. ad Saecul. iv.*, p. i., [Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., tom. v.], p. lxii., &c. [*St. Maurus*, whose name a distinguished congregation still bears, was one of the most famous disciples of *Benedict*; though some have questioned his existence. *Placidus* was a historian of this order. Of *Augustine*, notice has already been taken. *Mellitus* preached to the east Saxons, and was afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, and very active in propagating the order.—The great and rapid dissemination of this order was wonderful. Many particular and new orders, distinguished from each other by their dress, their caps, and forms of government, originated from it. The Carthusians, Cisterians, Cœlestines, Grandimontensians, Præmonstratensians, Cluniacensians, Camaldulensians, &c., were only branches growing out of this principal stock. The most respecta-

ble and renowned men were trained up in it. *Volaterranus* enumerates 200 cardinals, 1600 archbishops, 4000 bishops, and 15,700 abbots and men of learning, who belonged to this order.—*V. Einem.*]

(20) *Ja. l'Enfant*, *Histoire du Concile de Constance*, tome ii., p. 32, 33.

(21) See *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiast. de M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 197. [*Procopius*, a teacher of eloquence at Gaza in the reign of *Justinian*, A.D. 520, &c., has left us several Commentaries on the scriptures, which are chiefly compilations from earlier writers: viz., on the Octateuch, (extant only in Latin); on the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, Gr. and Lat., Jugd. Bat., 1620, 4to; on Isaiah, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1580; on Proverbs, and the twelve Minor Prophets; never published. Also many neat Epistles, published by *Aldus*.—*Tr.*]

(22) [*John Maxentius* was a Seythian monk, a presbyter of Antioch, and flourished about the year 520. Several of his epistles and tracts, defending the doctrine that *one of the Trinity* was crucified, and opposing the Pelagian errors, are extant in Latin, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, tom. ix. His *scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite*, are published, Gr. and Lat., with that author.—*Tr.*]

(23) [*Agapetus*, a deacon in the great church at Constantinople, flourished A.D. 527, in which year he composed his *Instructions* for a prince, addressed to the emperor *Justinian*, then recently invested with the purple. The book contains 72 heads of advice, displaying good common sense, but not profound. It has been often published: as, Venice, 1509, 8vo, and with a commentary, Franeker, 1608, 8vo, Francf., 1659, 4to, Lips., 1669, 8vo.—*Tr.*]

and energetic in opposing the heresies of the times.(24) *John*, bishop of Constantinople, called the *Faster* on account of the austerity of his life, distinguished himself by some small treatises, and particularly by his *Pœnitential*.(25) *Leontius* of Byzantium has left us a book *against the heretics*, and some other writings.(26) *Evagrius* Scholasticus has furnished us with an *Ecclesiastical History*; but it is disfigured with fabulous tales.(27) *Anastasius* Sinaita is generally supposed to be the author of a well-known yet futile book, entitled *Hodegus contra Acephalos* (a Guide against the Acephali).(28)

(24) [*Eulogius* of Antioch, was made bishop of Alexandria in the year 581. A homily of his is extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Combefis*, Actuar. Nov., tom. i., and large extracts from his vi. Books against *Novatus*, his ii. Books against *Timotheus* and *Severus*, his Book against *Theodosius* and *Severus*, and another against the compromise between the Theodosians and the Gainaites, are in *Photius*, Biblioth. Codex, Nos. 182, 208, 225-227.—*Tr.*]

(25) [*John* the *Faster* was a native of Cappadocia, and bishop of Constantinople from 585 to 596. The title of *universal bishop* given him in the council of 589, involved him in trouble with *Pelagius* II. and *Gregory* I., bishops of Rome. Two of his Homilies are extant, Gr. and Lat., among those of *Chrysostom*; and his *Pœnitential*, (or rules for treating penitents), and a discourse on confessions and penitence, are published, Gr. and Lat., by *Morin*, de Pœnitentia, Appendix, p. 77, 92.—*Tr.*]

(26) [*Leontius* of Byzantium, was first an advocate, and then a monk in a monastery in Palestine, and flourished A.D. 590 and onward. *Cyril* (in his life of *St. Sabas*, cap. 72) says he was accused of Origenism. *Vossius* (de Hist. Gr., l. iv., c. 8) thinks he was the same as *Leontius*, bishop of Cyprus. He wrote de Sectis Liber, Gr. and Lat., in Actuar. Biblioth. Patr., Paris, 1624, tom. i., p. 493; likewise adv. Eutychianos et Nestorianos, l. iii., adv. Fraudes Apollinaristar., lib. ii. Solutiones Argumentorum Severi: Dubitationes et Definitiones contra eos, qui negant in Christo duas naturas; extant in Latin, Biblioth. Patr., tom. ix.; also an Oration on the man blind from his birth, Gr. and Lat., in *Combefis*, Actuar. Nov., tom. i., and some other tracts, never published.—*Tr.*]

(27) [*Evagrius* Scholasticus was born at Epiphania in Syria, A.D. 536. At four years of age he was sent to school; after grammar, he studied rhetoric, and became an advocate at the bar in Antioch. He was much esteemed, and especially by *Gregory* bishop of Antioch, whom he often assisted in difficult cases. The emperor *Tiberius* made him a quæstor; and *Maurice*, an honorary præfect. His only work that has

reached us, is his Ecclesiastical History, in vi. Books. It is a continuation of the histories of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, from the council of Ephesus in 431, to the year 594. Its chief faults are those of the age, credulity, and an over estimation of monkish legends and other trash. It was published, Gr. and Lat., by *Valesius*, among the other Gr. Eccles. Historians; and has been translated into English, Cambridge, 1683, fol.—*Tr.*]

(28) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque Eccles. de *M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 232, and *Burat*, Bibliothèque choisie, tome ii., p. 21, &c. [There were three persons called *Anastasius Sinaita*. The first, after being a monk in the monastery on Mount Sinai, was made patriarch of Antioch A.D. 561, but was banished in the year 570, for opposing the edict of *Justinian* respecting the incorruptibility of Christ's body. He was restored in 592, and died in 599. He was a learned and orthodox man, and a considerable writer. The second of this name, was the immediate successor of the first in the see of Antioch, from A.D. 599 to A.D. 609, when he was murdered by the Jews. He translated the work of *Gregory* the Great on the Pastoral office, from Latin into Greek: but the translation is lost.—The third *Anastasius* flourished about A.D. 685. He was a mere monk of Mount Sinai. He wrote a compendious account of heresies, and of the councils that condemned them, from the earliest times to the year 680; which still exists in MS.—The Ὁδηγός, or *Guide to shun the Acephali*, is a rhapsody without method and without merit. It has been ascribed to the third *Anastasius*; because it contains several allusions to events posterior to the times of the two first of this name. Yet as it relates to controversies in which the first *Anastasius* is known to have been much engaged, some have supposed it was originally composed by him or from his writings, with subsequent additions or interpolations. It was printed, Gr. and Lat., by *Gretser*, Ingolst., 1604, 4to.—The 154 Questions and Answers respecting biblical subjects, ascribed to the first *Anastasius*, and published, Gr. and Lat., by *Gretser*, 1617, 4to, also bear marks of a later age. *Cave* supposes they

were compiled from the works of the *first* Anastasius. His xi. Books of *Contemplations on the Hexæmeron* were published in Latin, Paris, 1609. Dr. *Aliz* published the 12th Book, Gr. and Lat., Lond., 1682, 4to. His five *doctrinal Discourses*, (on the Trinity, incarnation, &c.), together with all the works just enumerated, are extant in Latin, Biblioth. Patr., tom. ix. Six of his *Homilies* are extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Combefis*, Auctuar. Nov., 1648, tom. i. Another tract of his, on the three Quadragesimæ, is extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Cutcher*, Monum. Eccl. Gr., tom. iii. Various other tracts of his exist only in MS., and a considerable number of others are lost.

The following is a catalogue of the Greek and Oriental writers of this century, omitted by Dr. *Mosheim*.

Olympiodorus, a deacon at Alexandria, who probably flourished at the commencement of this century. He wrote several *commentaries* on the scriptures. His short *Comment on Ecclesiastes* is extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuar., tom. ii. His *Comment on Lamentations*, Lat., Rome, 1598, 4to, and his *Commentary on Job*, is preserved almost entire in the *Catena* on Job, published, Gr. and Lat., by *Patr. Janus*, Lond., 1637, fol.

Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus in Caria, a Eutychian who flourished under *Anastasius* A.D. 510, and was active in the contests of his times. On the accession of *Justin*, A.D. 518, he fled to Alexandria; where he advanced the idea that *Christ's* body was always *incapable of corruption*, and produced a division and a party among the Monophysites. He wrote a *Commentary on Job*, which is often quoted in the *Catena* on Job, published, Lond., 1637, fol.

Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople A.D. 511–517, distinguished for his hatred of his predecessor *Macedonius*. He wrote a book on the various heresies, which is extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Combefis*, Auctuar. Nov., tom. ii., and more perfect in *Cutcher*, Monum. Eccl. Gr., tom. iii., p. 377.

Severus, a leading man among the *Acephali* or *Monophysites*, was in his youth a pagan, and studied in the law school at Berytus; afterwards he became a monk at Gaza, and embracing and propagating Eutychian principles, was expelled the monastery. He repaired to Constantinople, and insinuated himself into the graces of the emperor *Anastasius*, who favoured the Eutychians. In the year 513, on the expulsion of the orthodox *Flavian*, he was made patriarch of Antioch, subscribed the Henoticon of *Zeno*, and condemned the council of Chalcedon. Some bishops withdrew from

his communion; but aided by Jews he violently persecuted the orthodox, and especially the monks of Palestine, of whom he slew 350, and left their bodies to be consumed by beasts of prey. On the death of *Anastasius* and the accession of *Justin* to the empire in 518, he was proscribed, and fled to Egypt, where he lived many years. Here he became involved with *Timothy* patriarch of Alexandria, and *Ganus* his deacon, by asserting that the body of *Christ*, previously to its resurrection, was corruptible. He next went to Constantinople, and persuaded *Anthimus* the patriarch to embrace Eutychian principles; and was producing great commotions, when two councils condemned both him and *Anthimus* A.D. 536. His subsequent history is little known. He was a man of talents, ambitious, restless, little careful to maintain consistency in conduct or belief, a great writer, and possessed of vast influence among the Eutychians. He wrote an immense number of epistles, many homilies and tracts, and extensive Commentaries on scripture; none of which are published entire, his works having been proscribed and ordered to be all burned by authority of the emperor. Yet numerous extracts are preserved, and some whole treatises are supposed to exist still in the East. The *Ritual* for baptism and public worship in the Syrian church, which is extant, Syr. and Lat., Antw., 1572, 4to, has been attributed to him. His Commentaries are often quoted in the *Catena* Patrum. See *Cace*, Histor. Litter., tom. i., p. 499, &c.

John of Cappadocia, patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 517–520. He condemned *Severus* of Antioch in 518; and the next year, by order of the emperor *Justin*, became reconciled with the Roman pontiffs. Five of his Epistles are extant in the *Concilia*, tom. iv. and v.

Theodorus Lector, flourished at Constantinople A.D. 518. He compiled an eccles. history from *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, in ii. Books: to which he annexed a Continuation, in ii. additional Books. Large extracts from the Continuation, by *Nicephorus Calistus*, are preserved, and published, Gr. and Lat., among the Gr. Eccl. Historians, by *Valesius*.

Timotheus III., patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 519–535, a warm Eutychian, and a protector of *Severus* and *Julian*, till he fell out with them respecting the corruptibility of *Christ's* body. He wrote numerous sermons and theological tracts, large extracts from which are preserved by *Cosmas Indicopleustes*.

Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 520–535. He confirmed the recon-

ciliation between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, made by *John* his predecessor; and approved the council of Chalcedon. Five of his Epistles to *Hormisdas*, bishop of Rome, are extant in the Concilior. Collect., tom. iv.

Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch A.D. 525–546. He was a native of Syria, a civil magistrate and count of the East, when made bishop. He wrote *pro Ecclesiasticis dogmatibus et Synodo Chalcedonensi*, libri iii.: which are lost, except copious extracts from the two first Books, in *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. 228, 229.

Simeon, Stylites junior. In his childhood he mounted his pillar, near Antioch, which he occupied 68 years, A.D. 527–595. He is often mentioned by *Evagrius*, who knew him well. His fifth Epistle to the emperor *Justinian* is extant, Gr. and Lat., in the transactions of the second Nicene council, Actio v. Concilior. tom. vii. Some other tracts of his exist in MS. in the Vatican library.

Zacharias Scholasticus, archbp. of Mytilene. He was first a lawyer at Berytus, then a bishop, and flourished A.D. 536. While at Berytus, he wrote a Dissertation or dialogue against the philosophers who maintain that the world is eternal; extant, Gr. and Lat., Lips., 1654, 4to, and in *Fr. Ducacus' Auctuar.*, tom. i. He also wrote a disputation against the two first principles of all things, held by the Manichæans; extant, Lat., in *Henr. Canis. Antiquæ Lection.*, tom. v., and both works in Biblioth. Patr., tom. ix.

Nonnosus, *Justinian's* ambassador to the Saracens, the Auxumitæ, and the Homerites, about A.D. 540. He wrote a history of his travels; from which *Photius* has preserved extracts, Biblioth. Cod. 3.

Isaac, bishop of Nineva, who turned monk, and travelled as far as Italy. He flourished about the year 540, and wrote 87 ascetic discourses, which still exist in MS. A bad Latin translation of 53 of them, much garbled, was published in the Biblioth. magn. Patr., tom. xi.

Arethas, archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, is supposed to have lived about A.D. 540. He compiled from *Andreas Cæsariensis* an *Exposition of the Apocalypse*; extant, Gr. and Lat., annexed to *Occumenius*, Paris, 1631.

Gregentius, archbp. of Taphar, the metropolis of the Homerites in Arabia Felix, flourished A.D. 540, and died 552. An account of his dispute with *Herbanus*, a learned Jew, is extant, Gr. and Lat., Paris, 1586, 8vo, and in *Fr. Ducaens*, Auctuar., tom. i. He also compiled a code of civil laws for the Homerites, by order of *Abram* their king; which still exists in MS.

Barsanuphius, an anchorite of Gaza, in the middle of this century, composed a large amount of ascetic writings, which still exist; but are not thought worth publishing.

Eutychius, a monk, and bishop of Constantinople A.D. 553–585. In the year 564 he was deprived of his see and banished by *Justinian*, for not admitting the incorruptibility of *Christ's* body while he was on earth; but he was restored in the year 578, and died in 585, aged 73. One epistle of his to pope *Vigilius*, is extant among the Acts of the fifth general council, A.D. 553, Concil., tom. v., p. 425.

Cyril, a monk of Palestine who flourished A.D. 557. He composed the lives of several monks, as of *St. John the Silentiary*, of *St. Euthymius*, and of *St. Sabas*; all of which are still extant.

Paul Cyrus Florus, a poet who flourished about A.D. 555. His poetic description of the church of *St. Sophia* at Constantinople, built by *Justinian*, is still extant, Gr. and Lat., by *Carol. du Fresne*, Paris, 1670, subjoined to the history of *Cinnamus*.

John, surnamed *Climacus* from his book, and *Sinaita* from his residence, and also *Scholasticus*, was a monk of Mount Sinai, who flourished about A.D. 564. He wrote *Scala Paradisi*, in 30 chapters, each marking a grade of virtue; also *Liber ad Pastorem*: both published, Gr. and Lat., by *Math. Rader*, Paris, 1633, fol.

John Scholasticus, a presbyter at Antioch, deputy to Constantinople, and bishop there A.D. 564–578. He wrote *Collectio Canonum* in 50 Titles, which included the 85 Canons of the Apostles; also *Nomocanon*, which, besides a collection of Canons, contained an epitome of the civil laws concerning ecclesiastical affairs; likewise, *Capita Ecclesiastica*. All these tracts were published, Gr. and Lat., in *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon., tom. ii., p. 499, 603, 660, ed. Paris, 1662.

Theodorus, bishop of Iconium, about A.D. 564, wrote the martyrdom of *Julitta* and her son *Cirycus*, only three years old, in the persecution of *Diocletian*; published, Gr. and Lat., by *Combefis*, Acta Martyr. antiq., Paris, 1660, 8vo, p. 231.

Eustratius, a presbyter of the great church at Constantinople, under *Eutychius* the patriarch, about A.D. 578. He wrote a book in confutation of those who say, the soul is inactive when separated from the body; published, Gr. and Lat., by *Lco Allat.* in his historical work concerning purgatory, Rome, 1655, 8vo, p. 319–581. He also wrote the *Life of Eutychius* the patriarch, published, Gr. and Lat., by *Surius* and by *Papebroch*.

Theophanes of Byzantium, flourished A.D.

§ 9. Among the Latin writers, the most distinguished were the following: *Gregory the Great*, Roman pontiff; a man of good and upright intentions for the most part, but greatly lacking in judgment, superstitious, and opposed to all learning, as his *Epistles and Dialogues* show. (29) *Cæsari-*

580, and wrote a History of the wars of the Romans with the Persians, A.D. 567-573, in x. Books; and some other parts of the history of his own times. Only extracts remain.

John Maro, a very prominent man among the *Maronites*, who flourished about A.D. 580. He wrote Commentaries on the Liturgy of *St. James*, which are still extant in Syria, and have been much quoted by *Abr. Echellensis*, *Morin*, *Nairon*, and others.

Leontius, bishop of Neapolis or Hagiopolis in Cyprus, who flourished about A.D. 600, and died about A.D. 620 or 630. He wrote an Apology for the Christians against the Jews: of which a large part is preserved in the fourth Act of the second Nicene council; Concilior. tom. vii., p. 236. He also wrote some homilies, and biographies of saints. But it is not easy to distinguish his writings from those of *Leontius* of Byzantium.—*Tr.*]

(29) His works were published by the French Benedictine, *Denys de St. Marthe*, in four splendid volumes, fol., Paris, 1705. For an account of him, see the *Acta Sanctor.*, tom. ii., Martii, p. 121, &c. [*Gregory the Great*, of senatorian rank, was born at Rome about A.D. 540. After a good education, being a youth of great promise, he was early admitted to the senate, and made governor of the city before he was thirty years old. The death of his father put him in possession of a vast estate, which he devoted wholly to pious and charitable uses. Renouncing public life, he became a monk, built and endowed six monasteries in Sicily, and a seventh at Rome, in which he himself lived under the control of the abbot. In 579, he was drawn from his monastery, ordained a deacon, and sent as papal legate to the court of Constantinople, where he resided five years, and became very popular. Returning in 584 with a rich treasure of relics, he retired to his monastery and to his favourite mode of life. In 590 he was raised to the papal chair, much against his will; and for 13 years and a half was an indefatigable bishop, a zealous reformer of the clergy and the monasteries, and a strenuous defender of the prerogatives of his see. He failed in his attempt to coerce the Illyrian bishops to condemn the *three chapters*; but succeeded in disturbing the harmony between the orthodox and the Donatists in Africa. He discouraged all coercive measures for the conversion of the Jews; endeavoured to confine the monks to their

monasteries and to a more religious life; and attempted to eradicate the prevailing vices of the clergy, simony and debauchery. He was instrumental in converting the Arian Lombards to the orthodox faith, and in restraining the ravages of that warlike people. He interfered in the discipline of foreign churches; remonstrated against an imperial law forbidding soldiers to become monks; laboured to effect a peace between the Lombards and the emperors; and attended to every interest of the church and the people under him. Yet he claimed no civil authority; but always treated the emperors as his lords and masters. In 595 he commenced his long contest with the patriarchs of Constantinople, who had assumed the honorary title of *universal bishops*. This title *Gregory* maintained to be blasphemous, antichristian, and diabolical, by whomsoever assumed. But he could not induce any of the Orientals to join with him. In 596, he sent *Augustine* and other monks to convert the Anglo-Saxons; which they accomplished. In 601, he defended the use of images in churches; allowed the Saxons to retain some of their pagan customs; and endeavoured to extend the power of *Augustine* over the ancient British churches. In the same year, when *Phocas* the usurper murdered all the imperial family, and clothed himself with the purple, *Gregory* obsequiously flattered him, and submitted to his usurpation. At length, worn out with cares and disease, he died in March, A.D. 604, having reigned thirteen years and a half. *Gregory* was exceedingly active, self-denying, submissive to his superiors, and courteous, sympathetic, and benevolent to all; yet he was an enthusiast for monkery, and for the honour of his see. His writings are more voluminous than those of any other Roman pontiff. His letters amount to 840; besides which, he wrote 35 Books on *Job*, called *Gregory's Morals*; a *Pastoral*, or treatise on the duties of a pastor, in 4 Books; 22 Homilies on *Ezekiel*; 40 Homilies on the Gospels; 4 Books of Dialogues. To him are ascribed also, an Exposition of the first book of *Samuel*, in vi. Books; an Exposition of the seven penitential Psalms; and an Exposition of the *Canticles*. His best works are his *Pastoral* and his *Morals*. His *Dialogue* is stuffed with monkish tales; and the Exposition of the penitential Psalms breathes the spirit of later times, and has been ascribed to *Gregory VII.* The best

us of Arles, composed some tracts on moral subjects, and a *Rule for Holy Virgins*.(30) *Fulgentius* of Ruspe, contended valiantly, in numerous books, against the Pelagians and the Arians in Africa; but his diction is harsh and uncouth, like that of most Africans.(31) *Ennodius* of Pavia was not contemptible among the writers of this age, either for prose or poetry; but he was an infatuated adulator of the Roman pontiff, whom he exalted to supreme power on earth, maintaining that he was amenable to no authority of mortals.(32) *Benedict* of Nursia, whose name is immortalized by his *Rule* for a monastic life, and the numerous families of monks who

edition is said to be that of *St. Marthe*; but that of *De Sousainville*, Paris, 1675, 3 vols. fol., is esteemed: the latest edition is that of *Joh. Bapt. Galliciolli*, Venice, 1768-76, in 17 vols. 4to.—His life by *Paulus Diaconus*, of the 9th century; and another by *John*, deacon at Rome, about 880, in iv. Books, are in *Mabillon's Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened.*, tom. i., p. 378-484. Among the moderns, besides *Du Pin*, *Bayle*, and *Oudin*, we have *Maimbourg's Histoire du Pontificat de S. Gregoire le Grand*, Paris, 1686, 4to: *Denys de St. Marthe*, *Histoire de S. Greg. le Gr.*, Rouen, 1698, 4to, and in the *Opp. Greg. M.*, tom. iv., p. 199-305. See also *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, (*Gregory I.*), vol. ii., p. 463-543, ed. Lond., 1750, and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xvii., p. 243-371.—*Tr.*]

(30) The Benedictines have recently given a learned account of *Cæsar*us, in their *Histoire litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 190. [His life, written by his pupils, *Cyprian*, *Messian*, and *Stephan*, in two Books, is extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta SS. Ord. Benedict.*, tom. i., p. 636-654. He was born in Gaul, A.D. 469. While a boy, he ran away, and entered the monastery of Lerins; where he lived many years, and became the butler. His health failing, he retired to Arles; of which place he was made bishop in the year 502. In the year 506, he was falsely accused of treason, and banished by *Alaric* king of the Visigoths, to Bourdeaux; but he was soon recalled. In 508, *Theodoric* king of the Goths, summoned him to Ravenna to answer a similar charge. Being acquitted, he visited Italy, and returned to Arles. He presided at the council of Arles in 524; and at that of Valencia in 529, he triumphantly maintained the principle, that a man cannot obtain salvation without preësting grace. He died A.D. 542, aged 73. He was zealous for monkery, and a strenuous advocate for the doctrines of *Augustine* respecting free grace and predestination. He has left us 46 Homilies, a Rule for monks, another for nuns, a treatise on the ten virgins, an exhortation to charity, an Epistle, and his Will. He also wrote two Books on grace and free

will, against *Faustus*, which are lost. His works are printed in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, vol. viii. and vol. xxvii. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litter.*, tom. i., p. 492.—*Tr.*]

(31) See, concerning *Fulgentius*, the *Acta Sanctor.*, tom. i., Januarii, p. 32, &c. [He was born at Carthage about A.D. 468. His father who was a senator, died while he was young; but his mother gave him an excellent education. While a boy, he had all *Homer* by rote, and could talk Greek fluently. He was early made procurator of the city. But soon weary of public life, he retired to a monastery, became a monk and an abbot, changed his monastery, endured persecution from the Arians, went to Syracuse, and thence to Rome in the year 500; returned to Africa again, was elected bishop of Ruspe in 507, was banished to Sardinia by *Thrasimund* the Arian king of the Vandals, recalled by *Hilderic* the succeeding king, and ruled his church till his death in 533. He was one of the most learned, pious, and influential bishops of his age. He wrote three Books ad Monimum, (on predestination and the kindred doctrines); one Book against the Arians; three Books ad *Thrasimundum regem*, (on the person and offices of *Christ*); ten Sermons on divers subjects; de Fide orthodoxa Liber ad donatum; de Fide Liber ad Petr. Diacon. eleven Epistles; de Trinitate Liber; on Predestination and Grace, three Books; and various other Tracts and Homilies; all of which were published, Paris, 1684, 4to. Among his lost works were seven Books on grace and free will, addressed to *Faustus*; and ten Books on predestination and grace, against *Fabian*. See *Cave's Hist. Lit.*, tom. i., p. 493.—*Tr.*]

(32) See the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 96, &c. [*Ennodius* was born A.D. 473, of a proconsular family. He married young; was afterwards deacon at Pavia, and subsequently at Rome; was twice papal legate to the emperor at Constantinople; was made bishop of Pavia in 511, and died in 521. He wrote nine Books of *Epistles*, or 297 in number, which are unpublished, and of little use to the history of

have followed it.(33) *Dionysius*, surnamed *Exiguus* on account of his lowliness of mind, has deserved well of his own age and of posterity, by his *collection of ancient canons* and his chronological researches.(34) *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, an African, procured himself reputation by some small treatises, especially by his *Abridgment of the canons*; but his diction has no charms.(35) *Facundus* of Hermiane was a strenuous defender of the *three chapters*, of which an account will be given hereafter.(36) *Arator* versified the Acts of the Apostles, in Latin, not badly.(37) *Primasius* of Adrumetum wrote *Commentaries on the epistles of Paul*, and a *book on heresies*; which are yet extant.(38) *Liberatus*, by his *Breviarium* or concise history of the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, merits a re-

his times; also a *Panegyric* on Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; an *Apology* for the Synod of Rome, A.D. 503; the life of *Epiphanius*, his predecessor at Pavia; life of *Antony*, a monk of Lerins; two Books of poems or epigrams; and various other little pieces; all of which were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris, 1611, 8vo; and in the Works of *Sirmond*, vol. i., Paris, 1696; also in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix.—*Tr.*]

(33) [See above, p. 392, § 6, and note (15). He has left us nothing in writing, except his monastic regulations, two Epistles, and two discourses; which are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix., p. 640, &c.—*Tr.*]

(34) [A monk of Seythian extract, who flourished at Rome A.D. 533, and died before A.D. 556. He was intimate with *Cassiodorus*, who gives him a high character for intelligence and virtue. Being familiar with Greek, he collected and translated a body of canons, including the first 50 Apostolic Canons, and those of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, Sardica, and some in Africa; he also made a collection of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, from *Stricianus* to *Anastasius II.*: both are extant in *Justell's Biblioth. Juris Canonici*, tom. i. He likewise translated a synodic epistle of *Cyrl of Alex*, a paschal epistle of *Proterius*, the life of *St. Pachomius*, an Oration of *Proclus*, *Gregory Nyssen* de officio hominis, and a history of the discovery of the head of *John the Baptist*: and composed a Paschal Cycle of 97 years, commencing A.D. 527, of which only a fragment remains. In the last work, he proposed that Christians should use the *time of Christ's birth* as their *era*; which proposal was soon followed universally. Hence, the Christian era is called the *Dionysian era*. But *Dionysius* miscalculated the time of *Christ's birth*, placing it four years (as most writers suppose) too late.—*Tr.*]

(35) [*Fulgentius Ferrandus* was a pupil of *Fulgentius Ruspensis*, and a deacon at Carthage. He flourished A.D. 533 and onward. His *Abridgment* of the canons is a short digest of ecclesiastical law, reduced

to 232 heads; it is in *Justell's Biblioth. Juris Canon.*, tom. i. He also wrote the life of *Fulgentius* of Ruspe, and seven doctrinal Epistles. All his works were published by *Chifflet*, Dijon, 1649, 4to, and then in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix.—*Tr.*]

(36) [*Facundus* was bishop of Hermiane in Africa, but spent many years at Constantinople, as a representative of the African churches at the imperial court. It was here, and in the years 546 and 547, that he composed his twelve Books pro defensione trium Capitulum, which he presented to the emperor *Justinian*. He also wrote a book against *Mutianus* Scholasticus, who had inveighed against the African churches for refusing communion with *Vigilius*. These, together with an *Epistle* in defence of the three chapters, were published by *Ja. Sirmond*, Paris, 1629, 8vo, and annexed to *Optatus* of Milevi, Paris, 1675, fol., and thence in the *Bibl. Patr.*, tom. x., p. 1, 109.—*Tr.*]

(37) [*Arator* was first an advocate, then one of the court of king *Athalaric*, and finally a subdeacon at Rome. He flourished from A.D. 527 to 544; in which latter year he presented his poetic version of the Acts in two Books, to *Vigilius* the Roman pontiff. He was much esteemed and honoured both by *Athalaric* and *Vigilius*. The poem was first published, with a commentary, at Salamanca in 1516; and afterwards in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. x., p. 125.—*Tr.*]

(38) [*Primasius*, bishop of Adrumetum or Justinianopolis in Africa, was a delegate to the court of Constantinople, A.D. 550 and 553, and defended the *three chapters*. His *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul*, was compiled from *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others. He likewise composed a *mystical Exposition of the Apocalypse*, in five Books. Both are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. x. He moreover wrote *de Haeresibus*, libri iii.; which are lost, unless they are those published in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. xxvii., the author of which has been so much disputed. See *Care*, *Hist. Litterar.*, tom. i., p. 525, &c.—*Tr.*]

spectable place among the writers of these times.(39) *Fortunatus* possessed a happy vein for poetry, which he employed on various subjects, and is read not without pleasure at the present day.(40) *Gregory* of Tours, the father of French history, would have been in higher esteem with the moderns, if his *Annals of the Franks* and his other writings did not exhibit so many marks of weakness and credulity.(41) *Gildas* of Britain is not to be passed over, because he is the most ancient of the British writers, and because his little book on the destruction of Britain contains many things worth being known.(42) *Columbanus* of Ireland acquired celebrity

(39) [*Liberatus* was archdeacon of the church of Carthage. He was sent twice as a legate to Rome, in 534 and 535. His *Breviarium* is esteemed very authentic and correct, though not elegant. It contains the history of that controversy for 125 years, or to about A.D. 553; and was the result of great research and labour. It was published by *Garnier*, Paris, 1675, 8vo, and in most of the Collections of Councils.—*Tr.*]

(40) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 464. [*Venantius Honorarius Clementianus Fortunatus* was born in Italy, and educated at Ravenna. About the middle of the century, having been cured of his diseased eyes by *St. Martin* of Tours, he determined to visit the tomb of that saint. From Tours he went to Poitiers, where he lived to the end of the century; wrote much, became a presbyter, and at last bishop of Poitiers. His poetic works are, two Books of short poems, dedicated to *Gregory* of Tours; four Books on the life of *St. Martin*; and several other short poems. They are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. x., and were published by *Brower*, Mogunt., 1603 and 1616, 4to. His prose writings are short Explanations of the Lord's Prayer and of the Apostles' Creed; and the lives of eight or ten Gallic saints; viz., *St. Albinus*, bishop of Angers; *St. Germanus*, bishop of Paris; *St. Radegund*, a queen; *St. Hilarius*, bishop of Poitiers; *St. Marcellus*, bishop of Paris; *St. Amantius*, bishop of Rodez; *St. Remigius*, bishop of Rheims; and *St. Paternus*, bishop of Avranches. The two following are doubtful; *St. Mauritius*, bishop of Angers; and *St. Medard*, bishop of Noyon. All these are extant either in *Surinus'* or *Mabillon's* collections.—*Tr.*]

(41) A particular account is given of him, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 372. For an account of his faults, see *Fran. Pagi*, Diss. de Dionysio Paris. § xxv., p. 16, annexed to his *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.*, tom. iv. But many of his defects are extenuated by *Jo. Launoï*, *Opp.*, tom. i., pt. ii., p. 131, &c. [*Georgius Florentinus Gregorius* was born of noble parentage, at Auvergne, A.D. 544. After an education under his bishop, he went to

Tours in the year 556, became deacon in 569, and bishop in 573, and died in 595, aged 52. He was much engaged in councils and in theological disputes, and at the same time a great writer. Orthodox, active, and rather indiscreet, he was frequently involved in difficulties, for he was deficient in judgment and acumen. His great work, *Annales Francorum*, (sometimes called *Chronica*, *Gesta*, *Historia*, and *Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum*), in ten Books, gives a summary history of the world, from the creation to the establishment of the kingdom of the Franks; and afterwards a detailed history, to the year 591. He also wrote *Miraculorum libri vii.*; containing the miracles of *St. Martin*, in four Books; on the glory of Martyrs, two Books; and on the glory of Confessors, one Book. Besides these, he wrote *de vitis Patrum* (monks) *Liber unus*; *de vita et morte vii. dormientium*; and an *Epitome* of the history of the Franks, composed before he wrote his *Annales*. All his works, collectively, were best edited by *Theod. Ruinart*, Paris, 1699, fol. They are also in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. xi.—*Tr.*]

(42) Concerning *Gildas* and *Columbanus*, none have treated more accurately than the Benedictines, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 279 and 505. [*Gildas* was surnamed the *Wise*, and also *Badonius*, from the battle of *Badon* (*Bath*) about the time of his birth, which was A.D. 520. By these epithets he is distinguished from *Gildas Albanus*, who lived a little earlier. He was well educated, became a monk of *Bangor*, and is said to have visited and laboured some time in Ireland. On his return he visited the monastery of *Lhancarvan*, lately founded by a nobleman of South Wales; whose example *Gildas* urged others to imitate. He spent some time in the northern part of Britain; visited France and Italy; and returned and laboured as a faithful preacher. He is supposed to have died at *Bangor*, A.D. 590; though some place his death 20 years earlier. His only entire work, now existing, is his *Epistola de excidio Britanniae*, et castigatione Ordinis Ecclesiastici; in which he depicts and laments over the almost total ruin of his country, and the

by his *Rule* for monks, some poems, and uncommon zeal for the erection of monasteries.(43) *Isidorus* of Seville, (Hispalensis), composed various grammatical, theological, and historical works; but shows himself to have lacked a sound judgment.(44) The list of Latin authors in this century may well be closed by two very learned men, the illustrious *Boëthius*, a philosopher, orator, poet, and theologian, who was second to no one of his times for elegance and acuteness of genius;(45) and *M. Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator*, who was indeed inferior in many respects to the former, yet no contemptible author.(46) Both have left us various productions of their pens.(47)

profligacy of manners then prevailing. It was first published by *Polydore Virgil*, in 1525; but the best edition is that of *Tho. Gale*, in the first vol. of his *Historiæ Britannicæ, Saxonicæ, &c.*, *Scriptores quindécim*, Lond., 1691, fol. He also wrote several letters, and perhaps some other pieces, of which only extracts remain. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litter.*, tom. i., p. 538, &c.—*Tr.*]

(43) [For a notice of *Columbanus*, see above, p. 392, note (14).—*Tr.*]

(44) [*Isidorus* Hispalensis, or junior, was the son of *Sererian*, prefect of Carthage in Spain, and brother of *Fulgentius* bishop of Carthage, and of *Leander*, whom he succeeded A.D. 595, as bishop of Seville. He presided in the council of Seville in 619, and in that of Toledo A.D. 633, and died A.D. 636. He was a voluminous writer; and has left us a *Chronicon*, from the creation to A.D. 626; *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum, et Suevorum*; *Originum*, sive *Etymologiarum*, Libri xx.; *de Scripturibus ecclesiasticis*, (a continuation of *Jerome* and *Gennadius*, embracing twenty-three writers); *de vita et morte Sanctorum utriusque Testamenti Liber*; *de divinis* sive *ecclesiasticis Officiis*, Libri ii.; *de differentiis* sive *proprietas verborum*, Libri ii.; *Synonymorum* sive *soliloquiorum*, Libri ii.; *de natura rerum* sive *de mundo*, Liber philosophicus; *Liber præmiorum* ad libros utriusque Testamenti; *Commentaria* in libros historicos Veteris Test. (a compilation); *Allegoriarum* quarundam S. Scripturæ Liber; *contra nequitiam Judæorum*, Libri ii.; *Sententiarum*, sive *de summo bono*, Libri iii.; *Regula Monachorum*; *de consuetu vitiorum et virtutum* Liber; *Expositio* in Cantica Cantorum; several *Epistles* and minor treatises. To him is falsely ascribed a collection of councils and decretals. His works were best published, Paris, 1601, fol., and Cologne, 1617, fol.—*Tr.*]

(45) [*Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boëthius*, born of an illustrious family at Rome, about A.D. 470, was sent in his childhood to Athens for education, where he spent eighteen years; and then returned

to Rome, the most learned man of the age. He was consul in the years 510 and 522. Soon after his return to Rome, he was made a patrician, and admitted to the senate. When *Theodoric* king of the Goths entered Rome, A.D. 500, *Boëthius* was appointed by the senate to address him. The king soon after made him one of his council, and master of his palace. After faithfully serving the king and his country for more than twenty years, he was in 523 falsely accused of a treasonable correspondence, condemned on suborned testimony, and sent to *Pavia*, where he was kept in close confinement a year or more, and then privately put to death by order of the king. He was a voluminous writer. Besides more than forty Books of translations and commentaries on *Aristotle*, *Porphyry*, and *Cicero*, he wrote two Books on arithmetic, five Books on music, two Books on geometry, and several tracts against the Eutychians, Nestorians, and other errorists. *But his most famous work was *de consolatione philosophiæ*, Libri v., written while in prison at Pavia. This was translated into Saxon, by *Alfred* the Great, (printed, Oxford, 1698); and into English by *Chaucer*, and by queen *Elizabeth*. It was composed partly in verse, and partly in prose; and has the form of a dialogue between *Boëthius* himself, and *Philosophy* personified; who endeavours to console him with considerations, derived not from Christianity, but from the doctrines of *Plato*, *Zeno*, and *Aristotle*. The works of *Boëthius* were published with notes, Basil, 1570, fol. See *Cave*, *Hist. Litterar.*, tom. i., p. 495, &c., and *Brucker*, *Hist. crit. Philos.*, tom. iii. *Gervaise*, *Histoire de Boëce*, Paris, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo, and *Schroëckh*, *Kirchen-gesch.*, vol. xvi., p. 99–121.—*Tr.*]

(46) See *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque eccles. de M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 211, &c. [*Senator* was part of the name, and not the title of *Cassiodorus*. This eminent statesman and monk was born of honourable parents, at Squillac in the kingdom of Naples, probably before A.D. 470. *Odoacer*, in 491, made him *Comes rerum*

privatarum et sacrarum largitionum. Two years after, *Theodoric* became master of Italy, and made him his private secretary; and subsequently governor of Calabria; but soon recalled him to court, and made him successively quaestor of the palace, master of the offices, consul, and praetorian prefect. The death of *Theodoric* in 526, did not deprive *Cassiodorus* of his high rank; but in 539, being now about 70 years old, he retired to a monastery, founded by himself near his native town in Calabria, where he lived more than twenty years in honourable retirement, devoted to literature and religion. His works are voluminous; viz., *Epistolarum Libri xii.* (his official letters); *Historiae Eccles. Tripartitae Lib. xii.*, (an abridgment from the Latin translations of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, made by *Epiphanius Scholasticus*); *Chronicon*, ab Adamo usque ad annum 519; *Computus Paschalis*; *de Rebus Gestis Gothorum*, Lib. xii., (which we have, as abridged by *Jordanes*; the original is supposed still to exist in MS.); *Expositio in Psalmos Davidis*; *Institutionis ad divinas lectiones lib. ii.*; *de Orthographia Liber*; *de vii. Disciplinis Liber*, (on the seven liberal arts; viz., the *trivium*, or grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the *quadrivium*, or arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy); *de Anima Liber*; *de Oratione*, et viii. partibus Orationis; short Comments on the Acts, the Epistles, and Apocalypse, (published separately by bishop *Chandler*, Lond., 1722, 8vo). Most of the other works are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. xi., and all of them were well edited by the Benedictines, in 2 vols. fol., Rouen, 1679. See *Carc*, *Hist. Litterar.*, tom. i., p. 501, and *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xvi., p. 128–154.—*Tr.*

(47) [The following are the Latin writers omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*.

Paschasius, deacon of the church of Rome, who took sides with *Laurentius* in his contest for the pontificate in 498, and died in 512. He has left us an Epistle to *Eugypsius*; and ii. Books on the Holy Spirit, against *Macedonius*; which are in the 8th vol. of the *Biblioth. Patrum*.

Laurentius, bishop of Novara in the north of Italy, flourished about A.D. 507. Two of his Homilies, on penitence and alms, are in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix.

Epiphanius Scholasticus, an Italian, who flourished about A.D. 510. He translated the Eccles. Histories of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodoret*, into Latin; that *Cassiodorus* might thence make out his *Historia Eccles. Tripartitia*, in xii. Books. The original translations are lost.

Eugypsius, abbot of a monastery near

Naples about A.D. 511. He wrote the life of *St. Severinus*, the apostle of Noricum; published by *Surinus*.

Hormisdas, Roman pontiff A.D. 514–523; who made peace, after a long contest, between the Oriental and Western churches. He has left us eighty *Epistles*, and some *Decretals*, in the *Concilior.*, tom. iv.

Orentius, or *Orientius*, bishop of Eliberis in Spain A.D. 516. He wrote *Commonitorium fidelibus*, metro Heroico, in ii. Books. The first Book is in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. vii.; and both, with other short poems, in *Edm. Martene's Thesaur. Anecd.*, tom. v., Paris, 1717.

Peter, a deacon, who vigorously aided the deputation of Oriental monks at Rome, A.D. 520, and wrote *de Incarnatione et gratia D. N. Jesu Christi*, Liber; extant among the works of *Fulgentius*, and in *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix.

Felix IV., Roman pontiff A.D. 526–530. Three *Epistles*, in the *Concilior.* tom. iv., are ascribed to him; but the two first are spurious.

Justinian I., emperor A.D. 527–565. Besides the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, (viz., *Institutionum lib. iv.* *Pandectar.* sive *Digestorum*, lib. l. *Codicis lib. xii.*, A.D. 528–535; and *Novellæ*, after A.D. 535), he issued six *Decrees* and *Epistles* relating to ecclesiastical affairs, which are in the *Concilior.* tom. v.

Nicetius, of Gallic extract, a monk, abbot, and archbishop of Treves A.D. 527–568. He was distinguished for piety, and the confidence reposed in him. Two of his tracts, *de Vigilis Servorum Dei*, and *de Bona Psalmodia*, were published by *Dacherius*, *Spicilegium*, tom. iii., (ed. nova, tom. i., p. 221, 223); and two of his letters, (to the emperor *Justinian*, and to queen *Chlosuinda*), are in the *Concilior.* tom. v.

Justus, bishop of Urgel in Catalonia, Spain, flourished A.D. 529, and died about A.D. 540. His *Commentary on the Canticles* is in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. ix. Two *epistles* of his are also extant.

Boniface II., Roman pontiff A.D. 530–532, has left us two *Epistles*; in the *Concilior.* tom. iv.

Cogitosus, an Irish monk, grandson of *St. Brigit*, and supposed to have lived about A.D. 530. He wrote *Vita Sanctæ Brigidæ*; which is published by *Canisius*, *Surinus*, and *Bolland*.

Montanus, archbishop of Toledo in Spain, during nine years, about A.D. 531. He has left us two *Epistles*; extant in the *Concilior.* tom. iv.

John II., Roman pontiff A.D. 532–535. At the request of *Justinian*, he solemnly sanctioned the orthodoxy of the expression:

One of the Trinity suffered crucifixion. One spurious and five genuine *Epistles* of his, are in the Concilior. tom. iv.

Marcellinus, Comes of Illyricum, flourished A.D. 534. His *Chronicon*, (from the year 379, where *Jerome's* closes, to the year 534), has been often published; and is in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. ix.

Agapetus, Roman pontiff A.D. 535, 536. Seven of his *Epistles* (one of them spurious) are in the Concilior. tom. iv., and one in tom. v.

Vigilius, Roman pontiff A.D. 537-555. He obtained his see by intrigue and duplicity; conspired against his predecessor whom he brought to the grave; and when confirmed in his see, showed himself supremely ambitious, and ready to sacrifice consistency, conscience, the truth itself, to promote his own selfish designs. He issued the most solemn declarations, both for and against the three chapters. In 547 *Justinian* called him to Constantinople, where he detained him seven years, and compelled him to condemn the three chapters, and himself also, for having repeatedly defended them. We have 18 *Epistles*, and several of his contradictory *Decretals*, in the Concilior. tom. v.

Gordianus, a monk of Messina, carried off by the Saracens in the year 539, when they burned and plundered that monastery. *Gordian* escaped from the Saracens and returned to Sicily, where he wrote the *life of Placidus*, the Benedictine abbot of Messina, who, with many others, was slain in the capture of that monastery. It is extant in *Surius*, and in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor., tom. i.

Victor, bishop of Capua about A.D. 545. He translated into Latin *Ammonius' Harmony* of the iv. Gospels, falsely ascribed to *Tatian*; and extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. iii., p. 265.

Cyprianus, a Gaul, and pupil of *Casarius* of Arles. He flourished A.D. 546, and wrote the *first book of the life and achievements of Casarius*. Both books are in *Surius*, and in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor., tom. i.

Mutianus Scholasticus, flourished A.D. 550. At the suggestion of *Cassiodorus*, he translated 34 Homilies of Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews into Latin; printed at Cologne, 1530.

Rusticus, a deacon at Rome, who accompanied pope *Vigilius* to Constantinople in 547, and showed more firmness than his bishop. His *Dialogus sive disputatio adversus Aꝑhalos*, (in which he inveighs against *Vigilius*), is extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. x.

Junilius, an African bishop, who lived about A.D. 550, has left us *de Partibus Divinæ Legis*, Libri ii., in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. x., p. 339.

Jornandes, or *Jordanus*, of Gothic extract, bishop of the Goths at Ravenna. His one Book *de Rebus Geticis*, or *Historia Gothorum*, from the earliest times to A.D. 540, is an abridgment of the 12 books of *Cassiodorus* on the same subject. His *de Regnorum et Temporum successione Liber*, is transcribed from *Florus*. Both works are extant in *Muratorii*, Rerum Italicar. Scriptores, tom. i., 1723.

Eugyppius, an African presbyter and abbot, who flourished about A.D. 553. He compiled from the works of *St. Augustine* a collection of sentences on various subjects, in 338 chapters; printed, Basil, 1542.

Victor, bishop of Tunis in Africa, a resolute defender of the three chapters, was in prisons and banishments from A.D. 555 to 565. He wrote a *Chronicon*, from the creation to A.D. 566; but the last 122 years of it are all that remain; published by *Scaliger*, with the *Chronicon of Eusebius*.

Germanus, (*St. Germain*), born at Autun, France, A.D. 496; deacon, 533; presbyter, 536; and bishop of Paris, A.D. 555-576. An epistle of his to queen *Brunchild*, written A.D. 573, is in the Concilior. tom. v. His life, written by *Venantius Fortunatus*, is in *Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened., tom. i., p. 222, &c.

Pelagius I., Roman pontiff A.D. 555-559. He was papal legate at Constantinople A.D. 535-545; and a strenuous opposer of the three chapters. Sixteen of his Epistles are in the Concilior. tom. v.

Martin, a monk, born in Pannonia. He travelled in Palestine, preached and became an abbot in Spain, and finally bishop of Braga in Portugal, A.D. 563-583. He has left us *Collectio Canonum*, (extant, in Concilior. tom. v., and in *Justell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon., tom. i.); *Sententiæ patrum Ægyptiorum*, (in *Roswyl*, de vitis Patr.); and *Formula honestæ vitæ*, extant in the Biblioth. Patr., tom. x., p. 282.

Pelagius II., Roman pontiff A.D. 579-590. He had much contention with the western bishops, who defended the three chapters; and after A.D. 589, with *John*, bishop of Constantinople, who assumed the title of *universal bishop*. Ten of his Epistles, and six decrees, are extant in the Concilior. tom. v.

Marius, bishop of Avenches in Switzerland for 20 years, flourished A.D. 581. He has left us a *Chronicon*, continuing that of *Prosper*, from 455 to 581.

Lucinianus, bishop of Carthage in Spain A.D. 584. He has left us three Epistles; in *de Aguirre*, Collect. max. Concil. Hispan., tom. ii.

John, a Spanish Goth, educated at Constantinople, returned to Spain A.D. 584,

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Continued sinking of Theology.—§ 2. This Exemplified.—§ 3. State of Exegetical Theology.—§ 4. Faults of the Interpreters.—§ 5. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 6. Practical Theology.—§ 7. Lives of Saints.—§ 8. Polemic Theology.—§ 9. Contests about Origenism.—§ 10. About the Three Chapters.—§ 11. The fifth general Council.—§ 12. Contests about one of the Trinity being Crucified.

§ 1. THE barriers of the ancient simplicity and truth being once violated, the state of theology waxed worse and worse; and the amount of the impure and superstitious additions to the religion of *Christ*, is almost indescribable. The controversial theologians of the East continued to darken the great doctrines of revelation by the most subtle distinctions and I know not what philosophical jargon. Those who instructed the people at large, made it their sole care to imbue them more and more with ignorance, superstition, reverence for the clergy, and admiration of empty ceremonies; and to divest them of all sense and knowledge of true piety. Nor was this strange, for the *blind*,—that is, persons for the most part grossly ignorant and thoughtless,—were the *leaders of the blind*.

§ 2. Whoever wishes to gain more distinct information on this subject, need only read what occurs in the epistles and other writings of *Gregory* the Great, among others, respecting the worshipping of images and departed saints, the fire which purifies souls after death, the efficacy of good works, that is, of human prescriptions and devices for attaining salvation, the power of relics to remove defects both of soul and body, and other things of the like character. A man of sense cannot help smiling at the generosity of the good *Gregory* in distributing his relics; but at the same time he must feel pity for the simple, stupid people, who could be persuaded that oil taken from lamps burning at the sepulchres of the martyrs, possessed uncommon virtues and efficacy, and added both holiness and security to its possessors.(1)

§ 3. To give directions for expounding the holy scriptures, was the object of *Junilius* in his two Books *on the parts of the divine law*.(2) The treatise consists of a few questions, neither scientifically arranged nor ju-

became an abbot, was persecuted by *Leurgild* the Arian king, and died early in the seventh century. He has left a *Chronicon* from A.D. 565 to 590.

Leander, archbishop of Seville (Hispanensis) in Spain, flourished A.D. 583, and died 595. He was a monk, an ambassador to Constantinople, and a principal means of the conversion of the Arian Goths of Spain to the Catholic faith. A monastic Rule is all we have of him; unless he was author of the *Missa Mozarabum*.

Dynamius, collector of the revenues of the Romish church in Gaul. He flourished

A.D. 593, and wrote the life of *St. Maximus*, bishop of Reiz; and the life of *St. Marus*, abbot of Bobi.

Eutropius, a monk, and bishop of Valencia in Spain, flourished A.D. 599. One of his Epistles is preserved by *Lu. Holstenius*, Codex Regular., Paris, 1663.—*Tr.*]

(1) See the *List of sacred oils* which *Gregory* the Great sent to queen *Theodelinda*; in *Theod. Ruinart*, Acta martyr. sincera et selecta, p. 619, [and in *Muratorius*, Anecdota Latina, tom. ii., p. 194.—*Schl.*]

(2) See *Rich. Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothèque de *M. du Pin*, tom. i., p. 229.

discreetly considered; for the author lacked the learning necessary for his undertaking. *Cassiodorus* likewise laid down some rules for interpretation, in his two books *on the divine laws*. Among the Syrians, *Philoxenus* translated the books of the New Testament and the Psalms of David into Syriac.(3) The number of interpreters was considerable. Among the Greeks, the best were *Procopius* of Gaza, (rather a pleasing expositor),(4) *Severus* of Antioch, *Julianus*, and some others. Among the Latins, the more prominent were *Gregory* the Great, *Cassiodorus*, *Primasius*,(5) *Isidorus* of Seville,(6) *Bellator*,(7) and a few others.

§ 4. All these expositors, (a few only excepted and particularly the Nestorians in the East, who, following the example of *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, searched for the true sense and meaning of the words), are scarcely worthy of the name of interpreters. They may be divided into two classes. Some merely collected the opinions and interpretations of the earlier doctors, in works which afterwards obtained the name of *Catenae* (or *Chains*) among the Latins.(8) Such is the *Catena of Olympiodorus* on *Job*, that of *Victor* of Capua on the four Gospels, and the Commentary of *Primasius* on the Epistle to the Romans, compiled from Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. Nor is *Procopius* of Gaza to be wholly excluded from this class, although he sometimes followed his own judgment. The others follow the footsteps of *Origen*, and neglecting wholly the literal meaning, run after allegories and moral precepts, deducing whatever they wish or desire from the sacred books by the aid of a roving imagination. Of this class, is *Anastasius Sinaita*, whose *Anagogical contemplations on the Hexaëmeron* expose the ignorance and credulity of the author; likewise *Gregory* the Great, whose *Morals on Job* were formerly extolled undeservedly; also *Isidorus* of Seville, in his *Book of allegories on Scripture*; and *Primasius*, in his *Mystic exposition of the Apocalypse*; and many others.

§ 5. An accurate knowledge of religious doctrines and a simple and lucid exposition of them, no one will expect from the teachers of these times. Most of them reasoned, as blind men do about colours; and thought they acquitted themselves nobly, when they had thrown out some crude and indigested thoughts, and overwhelmed opposers with the artillery of words. Yet among the writers of this age, may be clearly discovered the marks and germinations of that *threefold* manner of treating theology, which still prevails both among the Greeks and the Latins. For some collected together sentences from the ancient doctors and councils, backed by citations from the Scriptures. Such was *Isidore* of Seville, among the Latins, whose *three Books of sentences* are still extant; and among the Greeks, *Leontius* of Cyprus, whose *Loci Communes*, or Commonplace-book, compiled from the works of the ancients, have been commended. From these ori-

(3) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient.* Vatican., tom. ii., p. 83.

(4) See *Rich. Simon*, *Lettres choisies*, tom. iv., p. 120, of the new edition.

(5) *Rich. Simon*, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.*, cap. xxiv., p. 337, and *Critique de la Biblioth. de M. du Pin*, tom. i., p. 226.

(6) *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque de M. du Pin*, tome i., p. 259.

(7) [*Bellator* was a presbyter, a friend of

Cassiodorus, and flourished A.D. 550. He wrote numerous Commentaries; viz., vi. Books on *Esther*, v. Books on *Tobit*, vii. Books on *Judith*, viii. Books on the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and x. Books on the *Maccabees*; all of which are now lost.—*Tr.*]

(8) See *Steph. le Moine*, *Prolegom. ad Varia Sacra*, p. 53, &c., and *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v., cap. 17, or vol. vii., p. 727, &c.

ginated that species of theology, which the Latins afterwards called *Positive Theology*. Others attempted to unfold the nature of religious doctrines, by reasoning; which was the method generally adopted by those who disputed against the Nestorians, Eutychians, and Pelagians. These may be fitly called *Scholastics*. Others again, who believed that all divine truth must be learned by internal feeling and by contemplation, assumed the name of *Mystics*. This threefold method of treating religious subjects, has continued down to the present day. A proper and complete system of theology, no one of this age produced; but various parts of theology were occasionally illustrated.

§ 6. To explain and inculcate piety and Christian duty, some gave *precepts*, while others employed *examples*. Those who gave precepts for a pious life, endeavoured to shape the Christian character either of persons engaged in the business of active life, or that of the more perfect who retire from the contagious influence of the world. A Christian life in the former case, they represented as consisting in certain external virtues and the badges of piety; as appears from the homilies and exhortations of *Cæsarius*, the Monitory Chapters of *Agapetus*, and especially from the Summary of a virtuous life, by *Martin of Braga*.⁽⁹⁾ In the latter case they aimed to withdraw the soul by contemplation from the intercourse and contagion of the body; and therefore advised to macerate the body by watching, fasting, constant prayer, and singing of hymns; as is manifest from *Fulgentius* on fasting, *Nicetius* on the Vigils of the servants of God, and on the advantages of Psalmody. The Greeks, for the most part, followed as their leader in these matters *Dionysius*, denominated the Areopagite; on whom *John* of Scythopolis, during this age, published annotations. How exceedingly defective all these views were, is visible to every one who is acquainted with the Holy Scriptures.

§ 7. To inculcate piety by *examples*, was the aim of all those who wrote *Lives of the Saints*. The number of these, both among the Greeks and the Latins, was very considerable. *Ennodius*, *Eugyppius*, *Cyril* of Scythopolis, *Dionysius Exiguus*, *Cogitosus*, and others, are well known. Nearly all these entertain their readers with marvellous and silly fables; and they propose for imitation none but delirious persons or those of perverted minds, who did violence to nature, and adopted austere and fantastic rules of life. To endure hunger and thirst without repining, to go naked about the country like madmen, to immure themselves in a narrow place, to expect to behold with their eyes closed an indescribable divine light; this was accounted holy and glorious. The less any one resembled a man of a rational and sane mind, the more confidently might he hope to obtain an honoured place among the heroes and demigods of the church.

§ 8. In efforts to settle theological controversies, many were diligent, and none successful. Scarcely an individual can be named who contended against the Eutychians, the Nestorians, or the Pelagians, with fairness, sobriety, and decorum. *Primasius* and *Philoponus* treated of all the heresies: but time has swept away their works. A book of *Leontius* on the sects is extant; but it deserves little praise. Against the Jews, *Isidore* of Seville, and *Leontius* of Neapolis, engaged in controversy: but with what degree of skill, may easily be conjectured by those who reflect on the cir-

⁽⁹⁾ See *Acta Sanctor. Martii*, tom. iii., p. 86, &c., [and *Biblioth. Patr.*, tom. x., p. 382. —*Tr.*]

cumstances of the age. It will be better therefore to proceed to a brief account of the controversies themselves which disturbed the church in this century, than to treat in detail of these miserable disputants.

§ 9. Although *Origen* lay under condemnation by many public sentences and decrees, yet the attachment of many to him, especially among the monks, scorned all limitation. In the West, one *Bellator* translated various books of *Origen* into Latin.(10) In the East, particularly in Syria and Palestine which were the principal seats of Origenism, the monks were exceedingly zealous : and they had the approbation of certain bishops, especially of *Theodorus* of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in defending the correctness and the authority of *Origen's* sentiments.(11) The subject was brought before the emperor *Justinian* ; and he issued a long and full edict addressed to *Mennas* the bishop of Constantinople, in which he strongly condemned *Origen* and his opinions ; and forbid his opinions' being taught.(12) The contest about the *three Chapters* commencing soon after, Origenism not only revived in Palestine, but it spread and gathered strength. These commotions were brought to a termination by the fifth [general] council, at Constantinople, assembled by *Justinian* in the year 553, when *Origen* and his adherents were again condemned.(13)

(10) [This is founded on a conjecture of *Huet*, (*Origeniana*, p. 252), who ascribes the Latin translation of *Origen's* Homilies on Matthew, in particular, to this *Bellator*.—*Schl.*]

(11) See *Cyril* of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* ; in *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier*, *Monumenta Eccles. Graecae*, p. 370, &c., and *Hen. Noris*, *Diss. de Synodo quinta*, cap. i., ii., in his *Opp.*, tom. i., p. 554.

(12) This decree is extant in *Jo. Harduin*, *Concilior.* tom. iii., p. 243, &c. [It was first published by *Baronius*, *Annal. Eccl.* ad ann. 538 ; and thence passed into all the collections of Councils.—*Tr.*]

(13) See the decree of the council in *Jo. Harduin*, *Concilior.* tom. iii., p. 283, &c. See also *Evagrius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., c. 38 ; and on this whole subject, see *Ju. Bagnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i., lib. x., c. 6, p. 517, &c. *Pet. Dan. Huet*, *Origeniana*, lib. ii., p. 224. *Lud. Doucin*, *Diss.* subjoined to his *Historia Origeniana*, p. 345, &c. [*Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xviii., p. 40-58, but especially *C. W. F. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii., p. 618-760.—This contest respecting *Origen* commenced among the Palestine monks about the year 520. One *Nonnus* and three other monks, belonging to the new *Laura* (or cluster of cells), were discovered to hold and to be propagating the opinions of *Origen*. *Sabas*, abbot of the old *Laura*, and supervisor of all the Palestine monks, opposed the schismatics. They were rejected from the *Laura*, but were restored again ; and in spite of opposition and persecution, they brought over many in both *Lauras* to their views.

The commotion became violent, and expulsions, fighting, and bloodshed ensued. Still it was only a contest among a few monks, living in two little societies or neighbourhoods in Palestine. *Justinian's* decree addressed to *Mennas*, was probably issued about the year 540 ; and it has been supposed, that the council of Constantinople which anathematized 15 errors of *Origen*, was an accidental council held about the year 541, and not the general council held in 553. However that may be, the death of *Nonnus* in the year 546, caused the Origenist party among the monks to become divided, and to fall into a declining state. The fullest enumeration of errors held by these Origenists, which has come down to us, is that of the 15 anathemas by the council of Constantinople. Yet *Justinian's* decree or letter to *Mennas* is nearly as full ; and it is more precise and lucid, as well as better substantiated by references to the works of *Origen*. In this decree, after a concise introduction, the emperor proceeds like a theologian, through ten folio pages, to enumerate and confute the errors of *Origen*. He then directs the patriarch *Mennas* to assemble what bishops and abbots could be found at Constantinople, and to condemn the subjoined list of Origenian errors ; their doings to be afterwards transmitted to all bishops and abbots for their confirmation, so that after this general consent shall be obtained, no bishop or abbot may be ordained without condemning Origenism as well as the other heresies. The list of errors to be condemned is then subjoined, as follows.—(1) " If any one says or believes, that human souls *pre-existed*, i. e., were once

§ 10. This controversy produced another which was much more lasting and violent, but which, as to the subject of it, was far less important. The emperor *Justinian* burned with zeal to extirpate the more strenuous *Monophysites*, who were called *Acephali*. On this subject he took counsel with *Theodorus* of *Cæsarea*, who was a friend to Origenism and also a Monophysite: and *Theodorus*, in order to procure tranquillity to the Origenists by stirring up a new controversy, and also to fix some stigma upon the council of Chalcedon and inflict an incurable wound on the Nestorians, persuaded the emperor to believe that the *Acephali* would return to the church; provided the Acts of the council of Chalcedon were purged of those three passages or *three Chapters*, in which *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, *Theodoret* bishop of *Cyrus*, and *Ibas* of *Edessa*, were acquitted of error; and provided that certain writings of these men, favourable to the Nestorian errors, were condemned. The emperor believed this; and in the year 544, ordered those three chapters to be expunged, but without prejudice to the authority of the council of Chalcedon. (14) But this edict

mere spirits, and holy; that having become weary of divine contemplation, they were brought into a worse condition; and that, because they ἀποψυχίσας, i. e., cooled down as to the love of God, they were therefore called in Greek ψυχῆς, that is, *souls*; and were sent down to inhabit bodies, as a punishment; *let him be anathema*.—(2) If any one says or believes, that the soul of our Lord pre-existed; and that it was united to God the Word before his incarnation and birth of the virgin; *let him be anathema*.—(3) If any one says or believes, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was first formed in the womb of the blessed virgin as those of other men are; and that afterwards God the Word and the pre-existent soul became united with it; *let him be anathema*.—(4) If any one says or believes, that God the Word was made like to all the celestial orders, that to the Cherubim he was made a Cherub, and to the Seraphim a Seraph, and to all the celestial Virtues one like them; *let him be anathema*.—(5) If any one says or believes, that in the resurrection, the bodies of men will be raised orbicular, and does not confess that we shall be resuscitated erect; *let him be anathema*.—(6) If any one says or believes, that Heaven, the sun, the moon, the stars, and the waters above the heavens, are animated, and are a sort of material Virtues; *let him be anathema*.—(7) If any one says or believes, that Christ the Lord is to be crucified in the future world for the devils, as he was in this for men; *let him be anathema*.—(8) If any one says or believes, that the power of God is limited, and that he created all the things he could comprehend; *let him be anathema*.—(9) If any one says or believes, that the punishment of devils and wicked men will be temporary, and will have an end, or that there will be a re-

covery and restoration of devils and wicked men; *let him be anathema*.—(10) And *Anathema to Origen*, who is called *Adamantius*, together with his nefarious, execrable, and abominable doctrine; and to every one who believes it, or in any manner presumes at all to defend it at any time: in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.—[Tr.]

(14) This decree is extant in *Jo. Harduin*, Concilior. tom. iii., p. 287, &c. *Eragrius*, Hist. Eccles., lib. iv., c. 38. [It is called *Justinian's Creed*; and professes to define the Catholic faith, as established by the four first general councils, (those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon), and to condemn the opposite errors.—*Dr. Mosheim's* description of the *three chapters* would lead us to suppose that certain chapters, sections, or paragraphs, in the *Acts of the council of Chalcedon*, were the three things condemned by *Justinian*. But this was not the fact. His decree does not avowedly condemn anything contained in the Acts of that council; nor does it use the phrase *three Chapters*. The phrase was afterwards brought into use, and denoted three subjects, (capitula, κεφάλαια), which were condemned by this decree of *Justinian*; viz., (1) the person and writings of *Theodorus* bishop of Mopsuestia, whom the decree pronounced a heretic and a Nestorian; (2) the writings of *Theodoret* bishop of *Cyrus*; not universally, but only so far as they favoured Nestorianism, or opposed *Cyril* of Alexandria and his 12 anathemas; and (3) an *Epistle* said to have been written by *Ibas*, bishop of *Edessa*, to one *Maris* a Persian, which censured *Cyril* and the first council of Ephesus, and favoured the cause of Nestorius. The council of Chalcedon had passed no decree respecting *Theodorus*; and it had left all the

met with opposition from the bishops of the West and of Africa, and especially from *Vigilius* the Roman pontiff, who maintained that great injury was done by it both to the council of Chalcedon and to deceased worthies who died in the communion of the church.(15) *Justinian* summoned *Vigilius* to Constantinople, and compelled him to condemn the *three Chapters*. But the African and Illyrian bishops, on the other hand, compelled *Vigilius* to revoke that condemnation. For no one of them would own him for a bishop and a brother, until he had approved those three chapters. *Justinian* again condemned the three chapters, by a new edict in the year 551.

§ 11. After various contentions, it was thought best to refer the controversy to the decision of a general council. *Justinian* therefore, in the year 553, assembled at Constantinople what is called the *fifth general council*. In this council, the opinions of *Origen*,(16) as well as the three Chalcedonian *Chapters*, according to the wishes of the emperor were judged to be pernicious to the church; yet it was a decision of the eastern bishops, for very few from the West were present. *Vigilius*, then at Constantinople, would not assent to the decrees of this council. He was therefore treated indignantly by the emperor, and sent into banishment; nor was he allowed to return till he acceded to the decrees of this fifth council.(17) *Pelagius* his successor, and the subsequent Roman

three bishops in good standing, though the Epistle of *Ibas* and some of the writings of *Theodoret* received censure. Hence *Justinian's* decree did not openly and avowedly contravene the decisions at Chalcedon; though virtually, and in effect, it did so. To understand the contest about the three *Chapters*, it should be remembered, that the *Nestorians*, who separated the two natures of *Christ* too much, and the *Eutychians* or *Monophysites*, who commingled them too much, were the two extremes; between which the orthodox took their stand, condemning both. But the orthodox themselves did not all think alike. Some, in their zeal against the *Nestorians*, came near to the Monophysite ground; and these of course felt willing to condemn the three *Chapters*. Others, zealous only against the Monophysites, were not far from being Nestorians; and these of course defended the three *Chapters*; for *Theodorus*, *Theodoret*, and *Ibas* had been leading men of this very character. Hence the interest shown by the Oriental bishops in this controversy. But in the West, where the Nestorian and Eutychian contests had been less severe, and where the persons and writings of *Theodorus*, *Ibas*, and *Theodoret* were little known, the *three Chapters* were felt to be of little consequence; except as the condemning them seemed to impair the authority of the decrees of Chalcedon, and to asperse characters once held venerable in the church.—It was doubtless a most rash thing in *Justinian* to condemn the three *Chapters*. But having done it, he resolved to persevere in it. The church was agitated

long and severely: and at length this precipitate act of the emperor, being sanctioned by the requisite authority, had the effect to shape the creed of the Catholic church from that day to this. See *Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii., p. 3-468, but especially p. 437, &c.—*Tr.*]

(15) *Hén. Noris*, de Synodo quinta, cap. x., &c.; *Opp.*, tom. i., p. 579. *Ja. Basnage*, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i., l. x., c. vi., p. 523, &c., [also *Dr. Walch*, ubi supra.]

(16) [According to the acts of this council, as they have come down to us, *Origen* was no otherwise condemned by this general council, than by having his name inserted in the list of heretics collectively anathematized in the 11th anathema.—The celebrated 15 anathemas of as many Origenian errors, said to have been decreed by this council, are found in no copy of its Acts, nor are they mentioned by any ancient writer. *Peter Lambecius* first discovered them in the imperial library at Vienna, in an old MS. of *Photius' Syntagma Canonum*, bearing the superscription, "Canons of the 165 holy Fathers of the fifth holy council at Constantinople;" and published them with a Latin translation; whence *Baluze* first introduced them into the Collections of Councils. But *Care*, *Walch*, *Valesius*, and others, suppose they were framed in a council at Constantinople, about A.D. 541. See note (13) above, p. 409; *Care*, *Hist. Litterar.*, tom. i., p. 558; *Walch*, *Histoire der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii., p. 644, 761; *Valesius*, note on *Evagrius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iv., c. 38.—*Tr.*]

(17) See *Peter de Marca*, *Diss. de decre-*

pontiffs, in like manner, received those decrees. But neither *their* authority, nor that of the emperors, could prevail with the western bishops to follow their example. For many of them, on this account, seceded from communion with the Roman pontiff; nor could this great wound be healed, except by length of time.(18)

§ 12. Another considerable controversy broke out among the Greeks in the year 519; namely, *whether it could properly be said, that one of the Trinity was crucified*. Many adopted this language, in order to press harder upon the *Nestorians*, who separated the natures of *Christ* too much. Among these were the Scythian monks at Constantinople, who were the principal movers of this controversy. But others regarded this language as allied to the error of the *Theopaschites* or Eutychians; and therefore rejected it. With these, *Hormisdas* bishop of Rome, when consulted by the Scythian monks, coincided; and great and pernicious altercations ensued. Afterwards, the fifth council, and *John II.*, a successor of *Hormisdas*, by approving of this language, restored peace to the church.(19) Connected with this question was another; *whether it was proper to say, Christ's person was compounded*: which the Scythian monks affirmed, and others denied.

to *Vigilii pro confirmatione Synodi quintæ*; among the *Diss.* subjoined to his work, de *Concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, p. 207, &c., [and *Bower's Lives of the Popes, (Vigilius)*, vol. ii., p. 382-413, ed. Lond., 1750.—*Tr.*]

(18) See, in preference to all others, *Hen. Noris*, de *Synodo quinta Oecumenica*; yet *Noris* is not free from all partiality. Also *Christ. Lupus*, Notes on the 5th Council, among his *Adnotat. ad Concilia*.

(19) See *Hen. Noris*, *Historia controversiæ de uno ex trinitate passo*; *Opp.*, tom. iii., p. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the monks with whom it originated, *Scythians*. But *Matur. Weiss. la Croze*, (*Thesaur. Epistolar.*, tom. iii., p. 189), conjectures that they were *Scetic* monks from Egypt, and not *Scythians*. This conjecture has some probability. [But *Dr. Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii., p. 296, 297, says of this conjecture: "it is not only improbable, but is certainly false." And the documents relative to the controversy, (of which he had there just closed the recital), do appear, as *Dr. Walch* affirms, "adequate to prove, that these men were really from Scythia." Together with the two modes of expression relative to the Trin-

ity, which they advocated, these monks were strenuous opposers of *Pelagianism*. Having had disagreement with some bishops of their province, particularly with *Paternus* bishop of *Tomis*, a deputation of them went to Constantinople with their complaint. Among these deputies, *John Maxentius*, *Leontius*, and *Achilles*, were the principal. The emperor rather favoured them; but the bishops of the East were not agreed. The emperor obliged the pope's legates at the court to hear the cause. But they were not disposed to decide it; at least, not as the monks wished. A part of them now repaired to Rome, where they stayed more than a year. *Hormisdas* disapproved their phraseology, but was not very ready to condemn it outright. While at Rome, these monks wrote to the exiled African bishops in *Sardinia*, and by taking part in *their* controversy, obtained their friendship. They certainly had many friends; but the ancient historians have transmitted to us only some slight notices of their history. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vii., p. 262-313. *Bower*, *Lives of the Popes*, (*Hormisdas*), vol. ii., p. 306-309.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES.

§ 1. Rites Multiplied.—§ 2. Explanation of the Ceremonies.—§ 3. Public Worship. The Eucharist. Baptism.—§ 4. Temples. Festivals.

§ 1. IN proportion as true religion and piety from various causes declined in this century, the external signs of religion and piety, that is, rites and ceremonies, were augmented. In the East, the Nestorian and Eutychian contests occasioned the invention of various rites and forms, which might serve as marks to distinguish the contending sects. In the West, *Gregory* the Great was wonderfully dexterous and ingenious in devising and recommending new ceremonies. Nor will this appear strange to those who are aware, that *Gregory* supposed the words of the holy scriptures to be *images* of recondite things. For whoever can believe this, can easily bring himself to inculcate all the doctrines and precepts of religion by means of rites and signs. Yet in one respect he is to be commended; namely, that he would not obtrude his ceremonies upon others: perhaps he *would* not, because he *could* not.

§ 2. This multitude of ceremonies required interpreters. Hence a new kind of science arose, both in the East and in the West, the object of which was to investigate and explain the grounds and reasons of the sacred rites. But most of those who derive these rites from the suggestions of reason and religion, betray their imbecility, and exhibit rather the fictions of their own brains than the true causes of things. If they had been acquainted with ancient opinions and customs, and had examined the pontifical laws of the Greeks and Romans, they would have taught us much more correctly from what sources many of the rites which the Christians regarded as sacred were derived.

§ 3. The public worship of God was still celebrated in the vernacular language of each nation; but it was everywhere amplified with various hymns and other circumstantial things. The new mode of administering the *Lord's supper*, magnificently, and with a splendid apparatus, or the *Canon of the Mass*, as it is called, was a prescription of *Gregory* the Great; or, as some would say, he enlarged and altered the old *Canon*. But many ages elapsed, before the other Latin churches could be prevailed on to adopt this Romish form.(1) *Baptism*, except in cases of necessity,

(1) See *Theol. Chr. Lilienthal*, de Canone Missae Gregoriano, Lugd. Bat., 1740, 8vo, and the writers on liturgies. [Different countries had different missals. Not only the East differed from the West, but in both there were diversities. In *Gaul*, the old liturgy continued till the time of *Charlemagne*. In *Milan*, the Ambrosian Liturgy (so named from *St. Ambrose* bishop of Milan) is not yet wholly abandoned. In *Spain*, the Mosarabic or ancient Spanish, is still used occasionally in certain places, though the Ro-

man canon was introduced partially in the 11th, and more fully in the 13th and following centuries. In *England*, the ancient Britons had one liturgy, and the Anglo-Saxons derived another from their apostle *Augustine* and his companions, and this not precisely the Roman. See *Krazer*, de Liturgiis, sec. ii., chap. 2-6. *Gregory* the Great introduced the responsive chant; and he established a school for church music, which was in existence at Rome as late as the 9th century.—*Tr.*]

was conferred only on the feast days, and those too of the highest class, or the greatest festivals.(2) As for the so called *Litanies* to the Saints,(3) the various kinds of supplications, the *stations* of Gregory,(4) the formulas of *consecration*, and other rites invented in this century to captivate the senses with a show of religion, we shall pass over them, to avoid prolixity. This subject requires the labours and investigations of a special treatise.

§ 4. The temples erected in memory and to the honour of the saints, were immensely numerous, both in the East and the West.(5) There had long been enough houses of worship to accommodate the people; but this age courted the saints, by offering them these edifices as a kind of presents; nor did they doubt at all, that the saints took under their immediate protection and care, the provinces, cities, towns, and villages, in which they saw such residences prepared for them.(6) The number of feast-days almost equalled that of the churches. In particular, the list of festivals for the whole Christian church was swelled, by the consecration of the day of the *purification of the Holy Virgin Mary*, so that the people might not miss their *Lupercalia*, which they were accustomed to celebrate in the month of February,(7)—and by the day of the *Saviour's conception*,(8) the birthday of *St. John*,(9) and some others.

(2) [Especially Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Whitsuntide, and St. John the Baptist; at least in Gaul. See *Gregory of Tours*, de Gloria Confessor., c. 69, 76, and *Historia Francor.*, lib. viii., e. 9.—*Schl.*]

(3) [The *Litanies*, of which there were the larger and the smaller, the common and the special, were in the previous centuries addressed only to God; but superstition now led men to address them to *Mary*, and to the other saints.—*Von Ein.*]

(4) [*Stations* denoted in early times *fasts*; but afterwards the *churches*, the *chapels*, the *cemeteries*, or other places, where the people assembled for worship. (See *du Cange*, Glossar. Med. et Infin. Latinitat., sub hac voce.) *Gregory* discriminated the different times, occasions, and places of public worship, and framed a service for each. This is the principal cause of the vast multiplication of liturgical formulas in the Romish church.—*Tr.*]

(5) [See *Procopius*, de Bello Gothico, lib. iv. and v.; also de Aedificiis Justiniani; where is mention of many churches erected to the virgin *Mary*.—*Schl.*]

(6) [Thus the Lombard queen *Theodelinda* built a church for *John the Baptist*, that he might pray for her and her people. (*Paul Diacon.*, Hist. Longobard., l. iv., e. 7.) And the French king *Clothaire* built a splendid temple to *St. Vincent*; because he believed that saint had helped him to vanquish the Goths. (*Siegbert*, Chronic.) For the same reason, rich presents were made to the churches. Thus *Childbert*, after conquering Alaric, gave to the church sixty cups, fifteen

dishes, and twenty cases for the holy Gospels; all of the finest gold, and set with costly gems. (*Gregory of Tours*, *Historia Francor.*, l. iii., e. 10.)—*Schl.*]

(7) [This was instituted by *Justinian*, A.D. 542, and fixed to the 2d day of February. The Greeks called it *ὑπαντή* or *ὑπαπαντή*, *meeting*; because then *Simeon* and *Anna* met the Saviour in the Temple. The Latins call it the *feast of St. Simeon*, the *presentation of the Lord*, and *Candlemass*; because many candles were then lighted up; as had been done on the *Lupercalia*, the festival of the ravishment of *Proserpine*, whom her mother *Ceres* searched for with candles. See *Hospinian*, de Festis Christianor., p. 52, &c., and *Adr. Baillet*, Vies des Saints, tom. i., Febr., p. 22, &c.—*Tr.*]

(8) [This feast is generally celebrated the 25th of March; and is called by the Greeks *ἡμέρα ἀπασιμῆς*, sive *ἐναγγελισμῆς*, the *day of the salutation*, or of the *annunciation*; because on this day the angel *Gabriel* announced to *Mary* that she should bring forth the Saviour. The Latins absurdly call it, the *annunciation of Mary*. To avoid interrupting the Lent fast, the Spaniards celebrated it on the 18th of December, and the Armenians on the 5th of January; the other churches kept it on the 25th of March. It is mentioned in the 52d canon of the council in Trullo, A.D. 691, as a festival then fully established and known; but at what time it was first introduced is uncertain. See *Suicer*, Thesaur. Eccles., tom. i., p. 1234, and *Adr. Baillet*, Vies des Saints, tom. i., March, p. 315, &c.—*Tr.*]

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES AND SEPARATIONS FROM THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Remains of the Ancient Sects. Manichæans. Pelagians.—§ 2. Donatists.—§ 3. Arians.—§ 4. State of the Nestorians.—§ 5. Eutychian Contests. Severus.—§ 6. Jac. Baradaeus, the Father of the Monophysites.—§ 7. Their State.—§ 8. Controversies among them.—§ 9. The Agnoëtæ.—§ 10. Tritheists.

§ 1. THE ancient sects, though harassed in numberless ways, did not cease to raise dangerous commotions in various places. Among the Persians, the Manichæans are said to have become so powerful as to seduce the son of *Cabades* the monarch; but the king avenged the crime by a great slaughter among them. They must also have been troublesome in other countries; for *Heracianus* of Chalcedon deemed it needful to write a book against them.(1) In Gaul and Africa, the contests between the Semipelagians and the followers of *Augustine* continued.

§ 2. The Donatists were comfortably situated, so long as the Vandals reigned in Africa. But when this kingdom was overturned, in the year 534, their condition was less fortunate. Yet they not only kept up their church, but near the close of the century, or from the year 591, ventured to defend and propagate their principles with more earnestness. These efforts of theirs were vigorously opposed by *Gregory* the Great, who, as appears from his Epistles,(2) endeavoured in various ways to depress the sect now raising its head again. And his measures doubtless were successful; for the Donatist church became extinct in this century, at least no mention is made of it after this time.

§ 3. The Arians, at the commencement of this century, were triumphant in certain parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Not a few of the Asiatic bishops favoured them. The Vandals in Africa, the Goths in Italy, many

(9) [I know not what induced *Dr. Mosheim* to place the introduction of this feast in this century. If the superscriptions to the homilies of *Maximus* of Turin (who lived A.D. 420) are correct, this feast must have been common in the fifth century; for three of these homilies are superscribed, as being composed for this feast. Perhaps *Dr. Mosheim* had his eye on the 21st canon of the council held at Agde, A.D. 506, (*Harduin's* Collection, tom. ii., p. 1000), where the festival of St. John is mentioned among the greater feasts. Yet as it is there mentioned as one already known, it must have been in existence some years.—Heathenish rites were likewise mixed with this feast. The feast of St. John and the dancing around a tree set up, were usages as well of the German and northern nations as of the Romans. The former had their *Noodfur*, (on which *Joh. Reiske* published a book, Francf., 1696,

8vo), and the latter used, about this time, [the 24th of June], to keep the feast of *Vesta*, with kindling a new fire amid dances and other sports.—*Schl. Adr. Baillet*, (*Vies des Saints*, tom. ii., June, p. 296), proves from the sermons of St. *Augustine*, that this festival was considered as of long standing in the church in the days of that father. *Augustine* himself has left us seven sermons, which he preached on the festival.—*Tr.*]

(1) See *Photius*, Bibl. Cod. cxiv, p. 291.

(2) See his Epistolar. lib. iv., ep. 34, 35, p. 714, 715, and lib. vi., ep. 65, p. 841, ep. 37, p. 821, and lib. ix., ep. 53, p. 972, and lib. ii., ep. 48, p. 611, Opp., tom. ii. [The emperor *Mauritius* issued penal laws against them, in the year 595. It is a probable conjecture of *Witsius*, (*Historia Donatist.*, cap. viii., § 9), that the conquests of the Saracens in Africa, in the 7th century, put an end to the Donatist contest.—*Schl.*]

of the Gauls, the Suevi, the Burgundians, and the Spaniards, openly espoused their interest. The Greeks indeed, who approved of the Nicene council, oppressed and persecuted them wherever they were able; but the Arians returned the like treatment, especially in Africa and Italy.(3) Yet this prosperity of the Arians wholly ceased, when, under the auspices of *Justinian*, the Vandals were driven from Africa and the Goths from Italy.(4) For the other Arian kings, *Sigismund* king of the Burgundians, *Theodimir* king of the Suevi in Lusitania, and *Reccared* king of Spain, without violence and war suffered themselves to be led to a renunciation of the Arian doctrine, and to efforts for its extirpation among their subjects by means of legal enactments and councils. Whether reason and arguments, or hope and fear, had the greater influence in the conversion of these kings, it is difficult to say.(5) But this is certain, the Arian sect was from this time dispersed, and could never after recover any strength.

§ 4. The Nestorians, after they had obtained a fixed residence in Persia, and had located the head of their sect at Seleucia, were as successful as they were industrious in disseminating their doctrines in the countries lying without the Roman empire. It appears from unquestionable documents still existing, that there were numerous societies in all parts of Persia, in India, in Armenia, in Arabia, in Syria, and in other countries under the jurisdiction of the *patriarch* of Seleucia, during this century.(6) The Persian kings were not indeed all equally well affected towards this sect; and they sometimes severely persecuted all Christians resident in their dominions;(7) yet generally they showed a marked preference for the Nestorians, before those who adhered to the council of Ephesus: for they suspected the latter to be spies sent among them by the Greeks with whom they agreed as to religion.

§ 5. The sect of the *Monophysites* was no less favourably situated; and it drew over to its side a great part of the East. In the first place, the emperor *Anastasius* [A.D. 491–518] was attached to the sect and to the dogmas of the *Acephali* or the more rigid *Monophysites*;(8) and he did

(3) *Procopius*, de Bello Vandal., l. i., c. 8, and de Bello Gothico, lib. i., c. 2. *Eragrius*, Historia Eccles., l. iv., cap. 15, &c.

(4) See *Joh. Ja. Mascovii* Historia Germanor., tom. ii., the subversion of the Vandalic kingdom, p. 76, and that of the Goths, p. 91. On the accession of the barbarians to the Nicene faith respecting God, see *Acta Sanctor.*, tom. ii., Martii, p. 275, and tom. ii., Aprilis, p. 134.

(5) [The latter is to me the most probable. The kings of these nations were very ignorant; and made war rather than science their trade. Among such a people, conviction of the understanding is little to be expected. Arguments of expediency would have more effect. They were surrounded by orthodox Christians, who would deprive them of their territories, on the ground that they were heretics. If therefore they would enjoy peace and quietude, they must make up their minds to embrace the Nicene faith. Many of these conversions also were brought about by ladies; for instance, the conversion

of *Hermengild* a West Gothic prince, by his French wife *Ingunda*.—*Schl.*]

(6) *Cosmas Indicopleustes*, Topographia Christiana, lib. ii., p. 125: in *Bern. de Montfaucon's* Collectio nova Patrum Graecor., of which the Preface, p. xi., &c., is worth reading.

(7) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic., tom. iii., pt. i., p. 109, 407, 411, 441, 449, and tom. iii., pt. ii., cap. v., § 2, p. lxxxiii., &c.

(8) *Eragrius*, Histor. Eccles., lib. iii., c. 30, 44, &c. *Theodorus* Lector, Historia Eccles., lib. ii., p. 562. A catalogue of the Works of *Severus*, collected from MS. copies, is in *Bernh. de Montfaucon's* Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 53, &c. [According to *Eragrius*, loc. cit., *Anastasius* was not zealous for any party, but was a great lover of peace, and determined neither to make nor to suffer any change in the ecclesiastical constitution; that is, he adhered to the *Henoticon* of *Zeno* his predecessor. This was taking the middle ground; for the more

not hesitate, on the removal of *Flavianus* from the chair of Antioch in 513, to elevate to that see *Severus*, a learned monk of Palestine, who was devoted to that sect, and from whom the *Monophysites* had the name of *Severians*.⁽⁹⁾ This man exerted all his powers to destroy the credit of the council of Chalcedon in the East, and to strengthen the party which professed but *one nature* in Christ; and his zealous efforts produced most grievous commotions.⁽¹⁰⁾ But the emperor *Anastasius* dying in the year 518, *Severus* was expelled from his see; and the sect which he had so zealously propagated, was restrained and depressed by *Justin* and the succeeding emperors, to such a degree that it seemed very near being ruined; yet it elected *Sergius* for its patriarch, in place of *Severus*.⁽¹¹⁾

§ 6. When the *Monophysites* were nearly in despair, and very few of their bishops remained, some of them being dead and others in captivity; an obscure man, *Jacobus* surnamed *Baradaeus* or *Zanzalus*, to distinguish him from others of the name, restored their fallen state.⁽¹²⁾ This indigent monk, a most indefatigable and persevering man, being ordained bishop by a few bishops who were confined in prison, travelled over all the East, on foot, constituted a vast number of bishops and presbyters, revived every where the depressed spirits of the *Monophysites*, and was so efficient, by his eloquence and his astonishing diligence, that when he died, in the year 578, at Edessa, where he had been bishop, he left his sect in a very flourishing state in Syria, in Mesopotamia, in Armenia, in Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia, and in other countries.⁽¹³⁾ He extinguished nearly all the

strenuous *Monophysites* rejected the *Henoticon*, and insisted on an explicit condemnation of the council of Chalcedon; while the more rigid Catholics, who also disliked the *Henoticon*, were for holding fast every tittle of the decisions of Chalcedon. See *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. vi, p. 930, 946, 947, 948.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. ii., p. 47, 321, &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.*, p. 127, 129, 130, 135, 138, &c. [See a notice of *Severus*, above, ch. ii., note (28), p. 397.—*Tr.*]

(10) *Eragrius*, *Hist. Eccles.*, lib. iii., c. 33. *Cyrillus*, *Vita Sabae*, in *Joh. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae*, tom. iii., p. 312. *Nouveau Dictionnaire histor. critique*, tom. i., Article *Anastasius*. [There is some ambiguity in *Dr. Mosheim's* statement. Who was *this man*, that exerted all his powers against the council of Chalcedon? *Dr. Maclaine* understood *Mosheim* to refer to the emperor *Anastasius*. But other translators preserve the ambiguity. Historical facts show, that it was *Severus*, rather than *Anastasius*, who persecuted the Chalcedonians. See *Eragrius*, as referred to above, lib. iii., c. 33.—*Tr.*]

(11) See *Abulpharajus*, *Series Patriarch. Antiochen.*, in *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. ii., p. 323. [For a full and minute examination of the *Monophysite* his-

tory, see *Walch's Historie der Ketzereyen*; namely, during the reign of *Anastasius*, vol. vi., p. 936–1054; under *Justin*, vol. vii., p. 52–128; and under *Justinian*, *ibid.*, p. 128–362.—*Tr.*]

(12) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana*, tom. ii., cap. viii., p. 62, 72, 326, 331, 414, &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.*, p. 119, 133, 425, &c., and *Liturgiae Oriental.*, tom. ii., p. 333, 342. *Faustus Nairon*, *Euoplia fidei Catholicae ex Syrorum monumentis*, pt. i., p. 40, 41. [*Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii., p. 481–490. *Jacobus Baradaeus* was a Syrian monk, and a pupil of *Severus* archbishop of Antioch. His ordination is placed by some in the year 545, by others in 551. His death, all place in the year 578. Some call him bishop of Edessa, others make him to have been bishop at large. The number of bishops, priests, and deacons ordained by him, is reported to be 100,000. That he put an end to the divisions and contests among the *Monophysites*, as *Dr. Mosheim* asserts, is not stated in any of the authorities quoted by *Walch*. As the *Monophysites* all over the East are to this day called *Jacobites*, from this *Jacobus Baradaeus*; so the orthodox Greeks are called *Melchites*, from the Syriac *Melcha*, a king; as being adherents to the religion of the imperial court.—*Tr.*]

(13) For the Nubians and Abyssinians,

dissensions among the Monophysites ; and as their churches were so widely dispersed in the East, that the bishop of Antioch could not well govern them all, he associated with him a *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence was at *Tagritum* on the borders of Armenia.(14) His efforts were not a little aided, in Egypt and the neighbouring regions, by *Theodosius* of Alexandria. From this man as the second father of the sect, all the Monophysites in the East are called *Jacobites*.

§ 7. Thus the imprudence of the Greeks and their inconsiderate zeal for maintaining the truth, caused the Monophysites to become consolidated into a permanent body. From this period their whole community has been under the government of two bishops or *patriarchs*, one of Alexandria and the other of Antioch, who, notwithstanding the Syrians and Egyptians disagree in some particulars, are very careful to maintain communion with each other by letters and by kind offices. Under the patriarch of Alexandria, is the *primate* or *Abbuna* of the Abyssinians ; and under the patriarch of Antioch, stands the *Maphrian* or *primate* of the East, whose residence is at *Tagritum* in Mesopotamia. The Armenians have their own bishop, and are distinguished from the other Monophysites by some peculiar rites and opinions.

§ 8. Before the sect of the Monophysites had acquired this strength and consistency, various disagreements and controversies prevailed among them ; and particularly at Alexandria, a difficult and knotty question was moved concerning the body of Christ. *Julian* of Halicarnassus,(15) in the year 519, maintained that the divine nature had so insinuated itself into the body of *Christ*, from the very moment of his conception, that this body changed its nature, and became *incorruptible*. With him agreed *Caianus* [or *Gaianus*] of Alexandria ; from whom the believers in this sentiment were called *Caianists*.(16) The advocates of this doctrine became subdivided into three parties ; two of which disagreed on the question, whether *Christ's* body was *created* or *uncreated* ; and the third maintained, that *Christ's* body was indeed corruptible, but, on account of the influence of the divine nature, never became in fact corrupted. This sect was vigorously resisted by the celebrated *Severus* of Antioch, and by *Damianus* ; both of whom maintained that the body of Christ, before his resurrection, was *corruptible*, that is, was liable to all the changes to which human bodies in general are. Those who agreed with *Julian*, were called *Aphthartodoctæ*, *Docetæ*, *Phantasiastæ*, and also *Manichæans* ; because from their opinion it might be inferred, that *Christ* did not *really* suffer, feel hungry, fall asleep, and experience the other sensations of a man ; but that he only *appeared* to suffer, to sleep, to be hungry, thirsty, &c. Those who agreed

see *Asseman*, loc. cit., tom. ii., p. 330. *Hieron. Lobo*, Voyage d'Abyssinie, tom. ii., p. 36. *Job Ludolph*, Comment. ad Historiam Aethiop., p. 451, 461, 466. For the other countries, see the writers of their history. (14) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatic., tom. ii., p. 410, 414, 418, likewise his Dissert. de Monophysitis, prefixed to tom. ii. of his Bibliotheca.

(15) [*Julian* is noticed among the writers of the century, above, p. 397, note (28).—*Tr.*]

(16) [*Gaianus* was archdeacon of Alex-

andria, under the patriarch *Timotheus* III. ; and on his death in the year 534, was elected patriarch of Alexandria, by the monks and the populace, in opposition to *Theodosius* the bishop of the court party. Great commotions now existed in Alexandria ; and *Gaianus* was soon deposed. He fled first to Carthage, and then to Sardinia ; and we hear little more about him. It is not known that he wrote any thing. See *Liberatus*, Breviar., cap. 20, and *Leontius*, de Sectis, Art. v.—*Tr.*]

with *Severus*, were called *Phthartolatræ*, and *Ktistolatræ* or *Creaticolæ*. This controversy was agitated with great warmth, in the reign of *Justinian*, who favoured the *Aphthartodocetæ*; but it afterwards gradually subsided. (17) A middle path between the two parties, was taken by *Xenaias*, or *Philoxenus* of Maug [or Hierapolis]; for he and his associates held, that *Christ* really suffered the ordinary sensations of a man; but that in him this was not the effect of nature, but of choice. (18)

§ 9. Some of the *Corrupticolæ*, as they were called, particularly *Themistius* a deacon of Alexandria, and *Theodosius* bishop of that city, in the ardour of disputation fell upon another sentiment towards the close of this century, (19) which caused new commotions. They affirmed that, while all things were known by the *divine* nature of Christ, to his *human* nature which was united with it many things were unknown. As they held to but one nature in Christ, [or were *Monophysites*], others inferred from their doctrine, that they made the divine nature to participate in this ignorance: and hence they were called *Agnœtæ*. (20) But this new sect was feeble; and therefore it declined and became extinct, sooner than might have been anticipated from the animated eloquence of the disputants.

§ 10. From the controversies with the Monophysites, arose the sect of the *Tritheists*. Its author was one *John Ascunage*, a Syrian philosopher, and a Monophysite. (21) This man supposed, that there are in God three numerically distinct natures or subsistences, all perfectly alike and connected by no common vinculum of *essence*; from which dogma, his adversaries deduced *Tritheism*. Among the patrons of this opinion, no one was more celebrated than *John Philoponus*, a grammarian and philosopher of great fame at Alexandria; and hence he has by many been accounted the founder of the sect, and the members of it have been called *Philoponists*. (22)

(17) *Timotheus*, de Receptione hæreticor., in *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.*, tom. iii., p. 409. *Liberatus*, *Breviarium Controv.*, cap. 20. *Jo. Forbes*, *Instructiones historico-theologicæ*, lib. iii., c. 18, p. 108, &c. *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental.*, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 457. [The contests respecting the *corruptibility* of Christ's body, both among the Monophysites and the orthodox, are fully examined in *Walch*, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii., p. 550-644.—*Tr.*]

(18) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.*, tom. ii., p. 22, and p. 168, &c.

(19) [This controversy began before the middle of the century; for *Themistius* was a deacon under *Timotheus* III., who died in the year 535. *Theodosius* succeeded in that year; but was removed about A.D. 537. The heat of the controversy seems to have been about A.D. 550 or 560; yet it was rife in the time of *Gregory* the Great, and the sect existed till some time in the seventh century.—*Tr.*]

(20) *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier*, in the *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.*, tom. iii., p. 641. *Mich. le Quien*, on *Damascenus* de Hæresibus, tom. i., p. 107. *Jo. Forbes*, *Instructiones his-*

torico-theol., lib. iii., cap. 19, p. 119. *Photius*, *Biblioth.*, Cod. cexxx., p. 882. [*Walch* has given a full and satisfactory account of the *Agnœtæ* or *Themistians*, in his *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. viii., p. 644-684. It appears that the *Agnœtæ* merely denied that the *human* nature of Christ became omniscient, by being united with the divine nature; —a doctrine which few at this day will condemn. Nor did their contemporaries in general understand them to go farther. But the writers of the middle ages represent them as denying altogether the omniscience of Christ; and many of the moderns, till quite recently, had similar views of this sect. See *Walch*, loc. cit., p. 675-679.—*Tr.*]

(21) See *Gregory Abulpharajus*, in *Jos. Sim. Asseman's Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.*, tom. i., p. 328, &c. [This is the only ancient writer that mentions this *John Ascunage*; and his statement is, that this *John* was a disciple of *Samuel Peter*, a Syrian philosopher who taught philosophy 20 years at Constantinople; that *John* succeeded him in the school; but having advanced his new doctrine, he was banished by the emperor *Justinian*.—*Tr.*]

(22) See *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, *Biblioth.*

As the sect advanced, it became divided into two parties, the *Philoponists* and the *Cononites*; the latter so named from its leader, *Conon* bishop of *Tarsus*.(23) These parties agreed respecting the doctrine of three persons in the godhead, but became at variance on the exposition of the doctrine of the *resurrection* of the body. For *Philoponus* maintained, that both the *matter* and the *form* of all bodies were generated and corruptible, and therefore, that both would be resuscitated at the resurrection; but *Conon* held that the *matter* only, and not the form of bodies, was corruptible and to be resuscitated.(24) To both these stood opposed the *Damianists*; so named from *Damianus*, [the Monophysite patriarch] of Alexandria. These discriminated between the divine *essence*, and the three *persons* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In other words, they denied that each person considered by himself, and in nature, was God; but maintained, that the three persons had a *common God or divinity*, by an undivided participation of which, each one was God. The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they denominated *Hypostases* [or *persons*]; and what was common to them, *God, substance*, and *nature*.(25)

Gr., lib. v., c. 37, tom. ix., p. 358. *Jo. Harduin*, Concilia, tom. iii., p. 1288. *Timothæus* de Receptione Hæreticor., in *Jo. Bapt. Cotelier's Monumenta Ecclesiæ Gr.*, tom. iii., p. 414. *John Damascenus*, de Hæresibus, Opp., tom. i., p. 103. ed. *Le Quien*. [*John Philoponus* was born, and probably spent his life, at Alexandria. He was a literary layman, and deeply read in the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy. Yet he was a Christian, and a Monophysite, as most of the Alexandrians in his day were. The time of his birth and death is unknown; but it appears, that he was a writer from about A.D. 560, till several years into the seventh century. Whether his own reflections, or the books of *John Asenusage*, first led him to his Tritheism, is uncertain. His works now extant are, a Book on the *Hexæmæron*; another on *Easter*; one against *Proclus*, to prove the world not eternal; a Book on the *Gr. dialects*; and *Commentaries* on various works of *Aristotle*. His lost works were, on the *Resurrection*; against the council of *Chalcedon*; against the sentiments of *John* archbishop of *Constantinople*, respecting the *Trinity*; against *Jamblichus* de *Simulacris*; against *Severus*; and a Book on *Union*, entitled *Διατριβή* sive *Arbitræ*, a valuable extract from which is preserved. See *Care*, Hist. Litteraria, tom. i., p. 267, and *Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. viii., p. 702, &c.—*Tr.*]

(23) *Photius*, Biblioth. Codex xxiv. *Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic., tom. ii., p. 329, &c.

(24) [For a full account of the disagreement between the *Cononites* and the other *Philoponists*, respecting the resurrection of the body, see *Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. viii., p. 762–778.—*Tr.*]

(25) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic., tom. ii., p. 78, 332, &c. [The controversies respecting the Trinity in unity which are the subject of this section, are minutely investigated by *Walch*, Historie der Ketzerereyen, vol. viii., p. 685–762. He concludes, that *Philoponus* and his sect were really, though perhaps unconsciously, *Tritheists*: for *Philoponus* held to a merely *specific unity* in God, and not to a *numerical unity*; that is, he taught that the three persons in the Trinity had a *common nature*, in the same sense that *Paul* and *Peter* had a common nature, and as all the angels have a common nature. (*Walch*, l. c., p. 728, &c.) The *Damianists* on the contrary, rejecting the idea of a mere *specific unity* in God, held the three divine persons to be *numerically one*, except as distinguished by *certain characteristic marks*: so that he was really on Sabellian ground. (*Walch*, loc. cit., p. 753–757.) See also *Müncher's Dogmengeschichte*, vol. iii., p. 512–516, ed. Marp., 1818.—*Tr.*]

CENTURY SEVENTH.

PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROSPERITY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Christianity propagated in China.—§ 2. The English converted.—§ 3. Also the Gauls, Suevi, Frieslanders, Franks, and Helvetii.—§ 4. Judgment concerning these Apostles.—§ 5. Jews compelled to embrace Christianity.

§ 1. THE Christian religion was in this century diffused beyond its former bounds, both in the eastern and western countries. In the East, the Nestorians with incredible industry and perseverance laboured to propagate it from Persia, Syria, and India, among the barbarous and savage nations inhabiting the deserts and the remotest shores of Asia; and that their zeal was not inefficient, appears from numerous proofs still existing. In particular, the vast empire of China was enlightened by this zeal and industry, with the light of Christianity. Those who regard as genuine and authentic the *Chinese monument of Sigan* which was discovered in the seventeenth century, believe that Christianity was introduced into China in the year 636, when *Jesujabas* of Gadala presided over the Nestorian community.(1) And those who look upon this as a fabrication of the Jesuits,

(1) This celebrated monument has been published and explained by several persons, in particular by *Athan. Kircher*, *China illustrata*, p. 53. *Andr. Müller*, in a distinct treatise, Berlin, 1672, 4to. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Relations anciennes des Indes et de la Chine de deux Voyageurs Mahometans*, p. 228–271, Paris, 1718, 8vo. *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Oriental. Vaticana*, tom. iii., pt. ii., c. iv., § 7, p. 538, &c. A more accurate copy, with notes, was expected from the very learned *Theophilus Siegf. Bayer*, much distinguished for his knowledge of Chinese literature. But his premature death frustrated the expectation. I see no reason why I should not regard this monument as genuine; nor can I conceive what advantage the Jesuits could have promised themselves from a fabrication of this sort. See *Gabr. Liron*, *Singularités historique et littéraires*, tome ii., p. 500, &c. [See also *Tho. Yeates*, *Indian Church History*, p. 85–96, Lond., 1818, 8vo. *Kircher's* translation

of the inscription, with a comment and some notes, is given in the Appendix to *Mosheim's Historia Eccles. Tartarorum*, p. 2–28. The monument is said to be a marble slab, ten feet long and five broad; dug up in the year 1625, at a town near *Si-ngan-fu*, capital of the province *Shen-si*. The top of the slab is a pyramidal cross. The caption to the inscription consists of nine Chinese words, formed into a square, and is thus translated: "This stone was erected to the honour and eternal memory of the Law of Light and Truth brought from *Ta-cin*, [*Judea*, or *Syria*], and promulgated in China." The principal inscription is in Chinese characters, and consists of twenty-eight columns, each containing sixty-two words. It first states the fundamental principles of Christianity; and then recounts the arrival of the missionaries in 636, their gracious reception by the king, their labours and success, and the principal events of the mission for 144 years, or till A.D. 780. There were two

may be fully satisfied by other and unexceptionable proofs that China, especially the northern part of it, contained in this century or perhaps even earlier numerous Christians, over whom presided during several subsequent centuries a *metropolitan* sent out by the patriarch of the Chaldeans or Nestorians.(2)

§ 2. The attention of the Greeks was so engrossed with their intestine dissensions, that they were little solicitous about the propagation of Christianity among the heathen.(3) In the West, among the Anglo-Saxons, *Augustine*, till his death in 605, and afterwards other monks sent from Rome, laboured to extend and enlarge the church. And the result of their labours and efforts was, that the other six Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto continued in paganism, gradually came over to the side of Christianity, and all Britain became professedly Christian.(4) Yet we need not believe that this change was wholly owing to the sermons and the exhortations of these Roman monks and teachers; a great part of it is rather to be ascribed to the Christian wives of the kings and chiefs, who employed various arts to convert their husbands; and likewise to the rigorous laws enacted against the worshippers of idols;(5) not to mention other causes.

persecutions, in the years 699 and 713. Soon after the second persecution, some new missionaries arrived. Then follows the date and erection of the monument, in A.D. 782. On the one side of this principal inscription there is a column of Chinese characters; on the other side, and at the bottom, is a Syrian inscription in the *Estrangelo* character, containing catalogues of priests, deacons, and others, with a bishop, arranged in seven different classes.—*Tr.*]

(2) See *Renaudot*, loc. cit., p. 51, 68, &c., et passim. *Asseman*, loc. cit., cap. ix., p. 522, &c. *Theophilus Sigefr. Bayer* tells us, (Præfat. ad Museum Sinicum, p. 84), that he possesses some testimonies, which put the subject beyond controversy. [It is the constant tradition of the Syrian Christians, that *St. Thomas* the apostle made an excursion to China; and the Christians of *Malabar* celebrate this event in their ordinary worship; and their primate styled himself metropolitan of Hindoo and China, when the Portuguese first knew them. See *Th. Yeates*, *Indian Church Hist.* p. 71–84. See also *M. de Guignes*, *Diss.* in the 30th vol. (p. 802, &c.) of the *Mémoires de Littérature, tirées des Registres de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*: which contains a defence of the genuineness of the Sigan monument, against the objections of *La Croze* and *Beausobre*. Likewise *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. xix., p. 291–298.—*Tr.*]

(3) [Yet *Constantius* Porphyrogenitus states, (de Administrando Imperio, c. 31, in *Bandurinus' Imperium Orientale*, p. 97, ed. Paris), that the *Chrobates*, (the *Croatians*), who then inhabited Dalmatia, from which

they had expelled the *Avares* by order of *Heraclius*, made application to that emperor for religious instructors; and that he procured priests for them from Rome, who baptized them, and one of whom became their archbishop. See *Scmler's Selecta Cap. Hist. Eccles.*, tom. ii., p. 20. *Lucius de Regno Dalmatiae*, l. i., c. 11. *Muratori*, *History of Italy*, tom. iv., p. 78, of the Germ. trans., and *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, in *Calendar. Eccles. universae*, tom. i., p. 499, &c.—*Schl.*]

(4) *Beda*, *Historia Eccles. gentis Anglor.*, lib. ii., cap. iii., p. 91, &c., cap. xiv., p. 116, lib. iii., cap. xxi., p. 162. ed. *Chiflet*. *Rapin de Thoyras*, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. i., p. 222, &c.

(5) See *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i., p. 61. [According to *Beda*, *De Thoyras*, and the other writers on English church History, the progress of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons, in this century, was as follows. In the year 601, pope *Gregory* confirmed *Augustine* as the archbishop of Canterbury; and advised him to appoint twelve suffragans under himself, and to send a bishop to York, who should in time become archbishop, and have also twelve suffragans. Yet Canterbury, or rather (on the death of *Augustine*) London, was to hold the primacy of all England. This arrangement was prospective, for the conversion of but a small part of the Saxons was as yet achieved. In 604, *Augustine* appointed *Justus* first bishop of Rochester in Kent, and *Mellus* first bishop of London among the East Saxons, and named *Lauricius* to succeed himself in the see of Canterbury. *Augustine* died the next year, having been in England but eight years, and hav-

§ 3. In this century, many of the Britons, Scotch, and Irish, eager to propagate the Christian religion, visited the Batavian, Belgic, and German

ing extended Christianity little farther than over Kent, and part of the present counties of Essex and Middlesex. *Laurentius* succeeded him. On the death of *Ethelbert* the first Christian king of Kent, in 616, his son and successor *Eadbald*, married his own mother-in-law, and renounced Christianity. Most of his subjects followed him in his apostacy. *Sebert* also, the Christian king of Essex, was succeeded by pagan sons; who expelled Christianity from their dominions, and obliged *Mellitus* the bishop to take refuge in Kent. The three English prelates, in despair, now resolved to quit England; and two of them actually retired to the Continent. *Laurentius*, while preparing to remove, pretended to receive, one night, a flagellation and a severe reprimand from *St. Peter*, for thus deserting the sheep of *Christ* and leaving them among wolves. The next morning he reported the matter to king *Eadbald*, and showed him his fresh wounds. The king was so moved, that he annulled his incestuous marriage, returned to the Christian faith, recalled the exiled bishops, and re-established Christianity in his dominions. Thus *Kent* became permanently Christianized. The East Saxons were not so easily reclaimed; nor were they the next to embrace Christianity.—In the year 625, *Edwin* king of Northumberland, including all the north of England, married *Ethelburga*, sister of *Eadbald* king of Kent and daughter of queen *Bertha*, engaging to tolerate her religion. She took with her *Paulinus*, who was ordained bishop for that purpose. The consequence was, that king *Edwin*, *Cofy* his pagan high-priest, his nobles, and most of his subjects, embraced Christianity; and *Paulinus*, in the year 627, baptized 12,000 Northumbrians in one day, in the river Swale, near Richmond. *Paulinus* became archbishop of York, and propagated Christianity to some extent in East Anglia, which included the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and the isle of Ely. But in 633, king *Edwin* was slain in battle, and a great apostacy ensued. *Paulinus*, in despair, returned to Kent, and became bishop of Rochester. Soon after, *Oswald* mounted the throne of Northumberland, after a long exile among the monks of Scotland. He being a Christian, laboured to restore Christianity. The Scottish monks sent him first *Corman*, and then the famous *Aidan*, bishop of Lindisfarne or Holy Island, to assist him. Thus Christianity became permanently established in *Northumberland*.—The people of *East Anglia* also returned to the

Christian faith about the year 636, their exiled king *Sigebert*, having brought with him from France *Felix* a Burgundian priest, who became bishop of Dunmoe, now Dunwich. *Oswald* and *Sigebert* are said to have patronised learning and set up schools throughout their dominions.—The kingdom of *Wessex*, including seven counties in the southwest of England, was converted about A.D. 635, by *Berinus*, a missionary directly from Rome, who became bishop of Dorchester.—*Sigebert* II. king of the *East Saxons*, who occupied the counties of Essex, Middlesex, and part of Hertfordshire, was persuaded by his friend *Osory* king of Northumberland, to embrace Christianity; and he, by the aid of *Chad* or *Cedda*, a Northumbrian prelate who was translated to London, permanently restored Christianity among the East Saxons about the year 660.—*Mercia*, including about seventeen of the midland counties, gradually became Christian, after the middle of the century. *Peada* the prince became a Christian, in the lifetime of his pagan father king *Peada*, at the instigation of his wife *Alchfluda*, daughter of *Oswi* the king of Northumberland; and he spread Christianity in the provinces over which he ruled. When made king, he soon brought the whole territory to embrace Christianity.—The last Saxon kingdom, *Sussex*, including the counties of Surry and Sussex, was converted about the year 686, by *Wilfrid* an exiled bishop of Northumberland.—A great dispute arising about the tonsure of priests, (whether only a considerable spot, or the whole head except a circular margin, should be shaved), and also about the time of *East-er*, those north of the Thames following the Irish or Gallic ritual, and those south of it, the Roman; a conference was held on these subjects at Whitby, in the year 664. Here *Oswi*, king of Northumberland, learning from the Romish party that *St. Peter* had the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that the other party could not deny that fact, declared he would not offend *St. Peter*, lest when he should arrive at the gates of heaven he should find the doorkeeper would not open to him. This wise thought decided the question with the majority. Still, however, the controversy continued; and several bishops retired in disgust, or were removed from their sees. Soon after, a bishop elect, being sent to Rome for ordination as primate of England, died by the way; and the pope ordained and sent *Theodorus*, a native of Tarsus, and a man of talents. *Theodorus* arrived at Canterbury in 669, and

tribes, and there founded new churches. And this it was that led the Germans afterwards to erect so many monasteries for Scots and Irishmen: some of which are still in being.(6) *Columbanus* an Irishman, with a few companions, had already, in the preceding century, happily extirpated in Gaul and the contiguous regions, the ancient idolatry, the roots of which had previously struck deep every where; and he persevered in these labours till the year 615, in which his death is placed, and with the aid of his disciples, carried the name of the Saviour to the Swabians, Bavarians, Franks, and other nations of Germany.(7) *St. Gall*, one of his companions, imparted a knowledge of Christianity to the Helvetians and Swabians.(8) *St. Kilian*, a Scotchman, converted a great many to *Christ* among the [*Fran-*

for twenty-one years was indefatigable in his efforts to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of England. For the furtherance of his designs, he held a council or synod at *Hertford* in 673, when annual synods were agreed upon, and other ecclesiastical regulations adopted. Another synod at *Hatfield*, in 680, established the faith of the English churches, on the basis of the five first general councils.—Hitherto there had been but one bishop in each kingdom of the Heptarchy, except *Kent*, which had two bishops; but now, the ambition of ruling induced the primate and some of the kings to divide bishoprics, in order to diminish the power of the lordly prelates. Hence, about the end of the century, the Heptarchy contained sixteen bishoprics: viz., *Canterbury* and *Rochester*, in *Kent*; *London*, in *Essex*; *Dunwich* and *Elmham*, in *East Anglia*; *Winchester* and *Sherburn*, in *Wessex*; *Litchfield*, *Leicester*, *Hertford*, *Worcester*, and *Synacester*, in *Mercia*; and *York*, *Lindisfarne*, *Hexam*, and *Withern*, in *Northumberland*.—The Irish and Scotch churches were in a very prosperous state during this century.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *Acta Sanctor.*, tom. ii., Februar., p. 362.

(7) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedicti*, tom. ii., p. 560, &c., tom. iii., p. 72, 339, 500, and elsewhere. *Adamanni*, lib. iii. de *S. Columbano*, in *Hen. Canisii* *Lectiones Antiquae*, tom. i., p. 674.—[See a brief account of *St. Columbanus*, above, p. 392, note (14).—*Tr.*]

(8) *Walafrid Strabo*, *Vita Sti. Galli*, in *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedicti*, tom. ii., p. 228, [ed. Venice, p. 215, &c.] *Hen. Canisii* *Lectiones Antiquae*, tom. i., p. 783. [*St. Gall*, or *St. Gallus*, was born in Ireland, of religious parents, who early committed him to *Columbanus* for education. He became a monk of *Bangor*, under *Columbanus*, and was one of the 12 Irish monks, who left Ireland with *Columbanus*, about the year 589, travelled through England to the Continent, and erected the mon-

astery of *Luxeuil* in Burgundy. When *Columbanus*, 20 years after, was driven from this monastery, *St. Gall* accompanied him in exile. Ascending the Rhine, they penetrated the heart of Switzerland, about the year 610, and took residence among the pagans at *Tuggen*, at the head of the lake of *Zurich*. Attacking idolatry, *St. Gall* here burned the pagan temple, and cast their offerings into the lake. This enraged the people, and the monks had to flee. Travelling through the canton of *St. Gall*, they came to *Arbon*, on the shores of the lake of *Constance*. Here *Willimar*, the presbyter of the place, treated them kindly, and aided them to form a settlement at *Bregents*, at the eastern extremity of the lake. Here the monks attempted to convert the surrounding pagans, and were not without some success. But at the end of two years, the unconverted procured an order from the duke for the monks to quit the country. *Columbanus* and the rest now retired to *Bobbio*, in Italy; but *St. Gall* was left behind, sick. When recovered, he retired into the wilderness with a few adherents, and erected the monastery of *St. Gall*, in the province of the same name. Here he spent the remainder of his days, in great reputation and honour. He refused the bishopric of *Constance*, which he conferred on his pupil *John*. His monastery flourished much, and spread light over the surrounding country. *St. Gall* died at *Arbon*, but was interred in his monastery, at the age of 95, according to *Mabillon*. His sermon at the ordination of *John* at *Constance*, and some epistles, are published by *Canisius*, loc. cit. His life by *Walafrid Strabo*, from which this notice is extracted, though full of legendary tales, is written in a far better style than the ordinary monkish biographies.—It appears, according to *Strabo*, that Switzerland was almost wholly pagan when first visited by *Columbanus* in 610, but that Christianity had then made considerable progress in Germany, from the lake of *Constance* all along the right bank of the Rhine.—*Tr.*]

conians or] Eastern Franks.(9) Near the close of the century, in the year 690, *Willebrord*, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied by eleven of his countrymen, viz., *Suidbert*, *Wigbert*, *Acca*, *Wilibald*, *Unibald*, *Lebwin*, the two *Ewalds*, *Werenfrid*, *Marcellin*, and *Adalbert*, crossed over to *Batavia* lying opposite to Britain, with a view to convert the Frieslanders to Christianity. From thence, in the year 692, they went to *Fosteland*, which most writers suppose to be the island of *Heligoland*: being driven from there by *Radbod* the king of the Frieslanders, who put *Wigbert* one of the company to death, they wandered over *Cimbria* and the adjacent parts of *Denmark*. Returning to *Friesland* in the year 693, they attacked the superstition of the country with better success. *Willebrord* was now created by the Roman pontiff, archbishop of *Willeburg*, [since called *Utrecht*], and died at an advanced age among the Batavians. His associates spread a knowledge of Christianity among the Westphalians and the neighbouring nations.(10)

(9) *Vita S. Kiliani*, in *Henr. Canisii* *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii., p. 171, &c. *J. Pet. de Ludewig*, *Scriptores rerum Wurtsburgens.*, p. 966. [See also the Life of St. Kilian, in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedict.*, tom. ii., p. 951-953, ed. Venice, 1733. According to these authorities, *St. Kilian*, *Chiluan*, *Cylian*, *Celian*, or *Kyllena*, was an Irishman, of honourable birth and good education. In early life he had a great thirst for knowledge; and being very pious, and possessing a perfect knowledge of missionary enterprises, he planned one of his own. Taking with him *Coloman*, *Gallon*, and *Arneral*, presbyters, *Donatus* a deacon, and seven others, he penetrated into Franconia, which was wholly pagan, and took residence at Herbipolis or *Wurtzburg*. Finding their prospects good, *Kilian*, *Coloman*, and *Totnan* went to Italy to obtain the papal sanction to their enterprise; which having readily obtained from *Conon*, (who was pope 11 months, ending Sept., 686), they returned to *Wurtzburg*, converted and baptized *Gosbert* the duke, and a large number of his subjects. But afterwards, persuading the duke that it was unlawful for him to have his brother's wife, *Geilan*, she seized an occasional absence of her husband, and murdered all the missionaries. This cruel act is placed in the year 696. But the massacre did not prevent the progress of Christianity; for the duchess became deranged, the assassins repented, and *St. Kilian* became the tutelar saint of *Wurtzburg*.—*Tr.*]

(10) *Alcuin*, *Vita Willebrordi*, in *Jo. Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. iii., p. 604, &c., [559, &c., ed. Venice]. *Jo. Mölleri* *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii., p. 980, &c. [*Beda*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. v., c. 11, 12. This famous missionary was born in Northumberland about A.D. 659, of pious parents. Educated in the monastery of *Ripon* (Hirpensis), in Northumberland, at the age

of 20 he went to Ireland, where he studied 12 years. At the age of 33 he commenced his mission, and sailed up the Rhine to Utrecht, in the dominions of *Radbod* the pagan king of the Friesians. Soon after he went to France, and by advice of king *Pepin*, visited Italy, and obtained the sanction of pope *Sergius* to his enterprise. Returning to Utrecht, he in vain attempted the conversion of *Radbod* and his subjects. Therefore proceeding northward, he landed at an island called *Fositeland*, which was on the confines of Denmark and Friesland, and so sacred that its fruits, its animals, and even its waters were holy, and whoever profaned them was to be punished with death. *Willibrod* and his company wholly disregarded the sacredness of the place, violated the laws, were arraigned before *Radbod*, who cast lots on their destiny, by which one was doomed to death, and the others dismissed. They now penetrated into Denmark. On their return to the confines of France, *Pepin*, who in 693 had vanquished *Radbod*, sent *Willibrod* again to Italy to be consecrated archbishop of Utrecht. Pope *Sergius* now gave him the name of *Clemens*. Returning clothed with dignity, his friend *Pepin* aided him in his work; and for about 50 years from his leaving England, he laboured, and with much success, as the apostle of the Frieslanders. He died about the year 740, at the advanced age of 81. Thus far *Alcuin's* narrative goes. Of his followers, it is said, that the two *Ewalds*, (the one called the *white*, and the other the *black Ewald*), were put to death by a Saxon king, and their bodies cast into the Rhine; that *Suidbert* preached to the Bructeri near Cologne, and at last at *Kaiserswerth* on the Rhine, where he died A.D. 713; that *Willibald* became bishop of *Eichstadt* in Bavaria; and *Marcellinus* bishop of the country along the Issel.—*Tr.*]

§ 4. Of these and other expeditions undertaken for the extension of Christianity, an impartial man who adheres to truth will not pass an indiscriminate judgment. That some of these preachers were men of honest simplicity and piety, no one can doubt. But most of them show manifest proofs of various sinful passions, of arrogance, avarice, and cruelty; and having received authority from the Roman pontiff to exercise their sacred functions among the barbarians, they did not so much collect holy congregations of devout Christians, as procure for themselves a people among whom they might act the part of sovereigns and lords. I cannot therefore strongly censure those, who suspect that some of these monks, being desirous of ruling, concealed for a time their vicious propensities under the veil of religion, and imposed upon themselves various hardships, that they might acquire the rank and honours of bishops and archbishops.

§ 5. Of the Jews, very few, if any, voluntarily embraced Christianity. But the Christians compelled many of them in different places, by means of penalties, to make an outward profession of belief in *Christ*. The emperor *Heraclius* being incensed against them, as is reported, by the influence of Christian doctors, made havoc of the miserable nation, and ordered vast numbers of them to be dragged reluctantly to baptism.(11) The kings of Spain and Gaul had no hesitation to do the same, notwithstanding the Roman pontiffs were opposed to it.(12) Such evils resulted from ignorance of the true principles of Christianity, and from the barbarism of the age.

CHAPTER II.

ADVERSITIES OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. Persecutions of the Christians.—§ 2. Mohammed.—§ 3. Judgment concerning him.—§ 4. Causes of the Rapid Progress of his Religion.—§ 5. Disposition of the Mohammedans towards the Christians.—§ 6. Sects among them.

§ 1. THE Christians suffered less in this than in the preceding centuries. By the Persian kings, they were at times persecuted; but the rage against them soon subsided. In England some of the petty kings oppressed the new converts to Christianity; but soon after, these kings themselves became professed Christians. In the East, especially in Syria and Palestine, the Jews sometimes rose upon the Christians with great violence;(1) yet so unsuccessfully as to suffer severely for their temerity. Those living among the Christians who secretly consulted about restoring the pagan religions, were too weak to venture on any positive measures.

§ 2. But a new and most powerful adversary of Christianity, started up in *Arabia*, A.D. 612, in the reign of *Heraclius*. *Mohammed* was indeed an illiterate man;(2) but still an Arab nobleman, naturally eloquent, and

(11) *Eutychius*, *Annales Ecclesiæ Alex- andr.*, tom. ii., p. 212, &c.

(12) [See some authorities on this subject, quoted by *Baronius*, *Annales Eccles.* ad ann. 614, sub fin., tom. viii., p. 239, &c., ed. Antw., 1600.—*Tr.*]

(1) *Eutychius*, *Annales*, tom. ii., p. 236, &c. *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*, *Historia Orientalis*, lib. i., c. iii., p. 129, &c.

(2) *Mohammed* himself professed to be destitute of science and learning, and even to be unable to read and write: and his fol-

possessing great acuteness of mind.(3) He proclaimed that he was sent of God, to overthrow all polytheism; and also to purge and reform, first, the religions of the Arabs, and next, those of the Jews and the Christians: and having framed a law which is called the *Koran*,(4) after gaining some

lowers have deduced from this his ignorance, an argument for the divinity of the religion which he taught. But it is hardly credible, that he was so rude and ignorant a man. And there are some among his adherents, who question the reality of the fact. See *Jo. Chardin*, *Voyages en Perse*, tom. iv., p. 33, 34. Indeed, when I consider that *Mohammed* for a long time pursued a gainful commerce in Arabia and the adjacent countries, I think he must have been able to read and write and cast accounts, for merchants cannot dispense with this degree of knowledge. [Dr. Mosheim here reasons in the very manner which he himself condemns; viz., such a thing does not occur at this day, and therefore it did not in ancient times. (See the *Introd.*, § 19, p. xix., *supra*). According to the *Koran* and all the Mohammedan writers, the times preceding Mohammed were times of ignorance among the Arabs. The tribe of *Hamyar* in Yemen had indeed for some centuries possessed a rude alphabet; but the use of it was not publicly taught, nor suffered except with special permission. The Arab Jews and Christians, likewise, undoubtedly had the use of letters; but all the pagan Arabs of the Ishmaelitic stock, including the tribe of *Koreish* as well as others, were without letters, previously to the introduction of the Cufic character in which the *Koran* was first written. This alphabet was invented at Cufah in Irak, a little before the times of Mohammed, and was first taught at Mecca, as it is said, by *Bashar* the Kendian, just before the institution of the Mohammedan religion. (See *Salé's Koran*, Prelim. Diss., § 1., p. 35.) Hence the best educated men in his tribe, up to the time he appeared, were unable to read and write; and much more the camel drivers and the men in active life, such as Mohammed was. Though of noble birth, he was an orphan child, whose whole patrimony was five camels and a female slave. His uncle, *Abu Tâleb*, who brought him up, twice sent him in his caravan to Syria, first when he was 13 and then when about 20 years old. In the interval he went on a military expedition against a neighbouring tribe. And this is all we know of him till the age of 25, when he was recommended to a rich widow of Mecca named *Cadijah*, to be her factor; and she sent him in that capacity to Damascus and the adjacent parts of Syria. On his return she gave him her hand and her fortune, and he became an opulent citizen of Mecca. This

was about 12 years before he assumed the character of a prophet. Now that such a man should be among the very first in Mecca to learn the use of letters, is not to be expected. Much less can we infer from his occupation, that he *must* have been able to read and write. That he employed his son-in-law *Ali*, as his scribe in committing the *Koran* to writing, is the constant testimony of his followers. And that he should appeal in that book to his own ignorance of letters, as proof that he did not write it out and polish it in his closet, seems to be good evidence of such ignorance. For his intimate acquaintances must have known whether that ignorance was real or not; and, as most of them were slow to admit his pretensions to a divine mission, it cannot be supposed that he would jeopardize his reputation as a man of veracity and of common sense, by referring them to what they knew to be false, as good evidence of his inspiration. See *Salé's Koran*, ch. i., vol. i., p. 192, and ch. xxix., vol. ii., p. 256. See also *Gibbon's Decl. and Fall of Rom. Emp.*, ch. l., not. 70, vol. v., p. 147, &c. And on the other side, *White's Sermons*, p. 203, 204, and notes p. xxvi.—xxxviii.; also *G. Bush's Life of Mohammed*, p. 38, 39.—*Tr.*]

(3) The writers on his life and religion are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, *Delectus et Syllabus Argumentor. pro veritate religionis Christianæ*, cap. l., p. 733, &c. To which may be added count *Boulainvilliers*, *Vie de Mahomet*, Lond., 1730, 8vo, which however is rather a romance than a history. *Jo. Gagnier*, *Vie de Mahomet*, 2 vols. 12mo, Amsterd., 1732, is commendable for the ingenuousness of the author, yet the style is dry. *George Sale*, a distinguished and very judicious author, in his Preliminary discourse prefixed to his version of the *Koran*, sec. ii., [p. 45, &c., ed. Lond., 1825. *H. Prideaux*, *Life of Mahomet*, 1697, 8vo. *Geo. Bush*, *Life of Mohammed*, N. York, 1834, 18mo. *Edw. Gibbon*, *Hist. of the Decl. and Fall of the Rom. Emp.*, ch. l., vol. v., p. 145, &c., ed. N. York, 1826. *P. Bayle*, *Dictionnaire Historique*, art. Mahomet. *Rees's Cyclopædia*, art. Mahomet. *Andr. Crichton's History of Arabia*, N. Y., 1834, vol. i., ch. vi. *Abulfeda*, *Annales Muslem.*, Ar. and Lat., 2 vols. 4to, Hafniae, 1790. *Abulfeda*, *de Vita et Rebus Gestis Mohammedis*, Arab. and Lat., Oxon., 1723. *Schroeckh*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xix., p. 327–405.—*Tr.*]

(4) For an account of the *Koran*, see, in

victories over his enemies, he compelled an immense multitude of persons, first in Arabia, and then in the neighbouring countries, to assent to his doctrines. Elated with this unexpected success, he now began to think of founding an empire; and he effected his object with no less felicity than boldness, so that at his death he saw himself the sovereign of all Arabia, and of several of the neighbouring countries. [After his marriage with Ca-dijah, Mohammed resided at Mecca, which was at that time the principal seat of Arabian idolatry, and much frequented by pilgrims on account of its famous temple called Caaba. Here he conceived the idea of reclaiming his countrymen from idolatry, and of restoring the primitive and only true religion, which had been taught by Abraham and Ishmael, by Moses and the prophets, and by Jesus Christ and his apostles. Retiring frequently to a cave near the city for solitude and meditation, he at length persuaded himself, or at least professed to believe, that he had divine revelations, and was a prophet whom God commissioned to reform mankind. He first stated his pretensions to his wife, who readily came into his views. She communicated the secret to her cousin Warakah, who being a Christian and somewhat acquainted with the Scriptures, yielded to her arguments, and assured her that the same angel who in ancient times appeared to Moses was sent to converse with Mohammed. His next convert was *Zeid* his servant, whom he now set free. *Ali* the son of Abu Tâleb next believed, and

preference to all others. *Geo. Sale's* very learned Preliminary Discourse, prefixed to his English version of that book. Add *Ver-tot*, Discours sur l'Alcoran; annexed to the third volume of his History of the Knights of Malta, in French: *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, tom. iii., p. 281, new ed. The book which the Mohammedans call the *Koran*, is a collection of papers and discourses discovered and published after the death of Mohammed; and is not that *Law*, which he so highly extolled. Perhaps some parts of the true *Koran* are still found in the modern *Koran*: but that the *Koran* or *Law*, which Mohammed prescribed to the Arabians, differed from the present *Koran*, is manifest from the fact, that Mohammed in our *Koran* appeals to and extols that other the true *Koran*. A book which is commended and extolled in any writing, must certainly be different from that in which it is commended. May we not conjecture, that the true *Koran* was an *Arabic poem*, which Mohammed recited to his adherents, and wished them to commit to memory, but which he did not write out? Such, it is well known, were the laws of the Gallic *Druids*; and such is said to be that Indian law, which the *Brahmins* learn and preserve in their memories.

[These conjectures of *Dr. Mosheim* appear to be wholly without foundation. There is no reason to believe, that there ever was a *Koran* essentially different from that we now have, or that Mohammed declined committing his pretended revelations to writing. The only argument adduced by *Dr. Mo-*

sheim is of no force at all, considering the manner in which the *Koran* came into existence. The book itself professes to have been composed by God, in the highest heavens, and thence sent down to the lower heavens by the angel *Gabriel*, who communicated it by parcels to *Mohammed*, during the twenty-three years that he claimed to be a prophet. Moreover, the parcels revealed last, often revoked or modified what had been revealed before, and likewise replied to the objections of infidels against the book. See *Sale's* *Koran*, vol. i., ed. Lond., 1825, ch. vi., p. 159; and vol. ii., ch. x., p. 31; ch. xvi., p. 107; ch. xxv., p. 213; ch. xcvi., p. 497. The Mohammedan doctors say, the *Koran* existed, together with the decrees of God, from all eternity, engraven on a table of stone hard by the throne of God, and called the *Preserved table*; that God sent the angel *Gabriel*, with a transcript of the entire *Koran*, down to the lowest heavens, where, during 23 years, he revealed it by parcels to *Mohammed*; that Mohammed caused these parcels to be written down by his scribe, as they were received, and published them at once to his followers, some of whom took copies, while the greater part got them by heart; that the original MSS. of the scribe, when returned, were thrown promiscuously into a chest, whence they were taken, after the prophet's death, and published collectively, in their present form and order, which is wholly without regard to dates, or a classification of subjects. See *Sale's* Prelim. Disc., § iii., p. 77-95.—Tr.]

afterwards *Abubeker*, *Othman*, *Abd'alráhman*, *Saad, al Zobeir*, and *Telha*—all his relatives and principal men of Mecca. At the end of three years, he concluded to make known his pretensions to all his family connexions assembled at a grand entertainment. But they turned the whole into ridicule. He was not discouraged, but proceeded directly to proclaim his mission in public to the people. They resisted him at once, and becoming irritated, began to plot his ruin. *Abu Táleb*, though far from becoming his disciple, yet protected his nephew from violence. At the end of five years, his few adherents met with so much abuse, that most of them fled the country, and are said to have retired to Ethiopia. In the sixth year, he gained some important converts; but the following year there was a grand conspiracy against him, and his own tribe became divided into hostile factions. In the tenth year of his mission, his powerful protector *Abu Táleb* died, and also his wife *Cadjah*. The violence of his enemies was now so great, that he deemed it advisable to retire from Mecca. He went to *Táyef*; but being soon driven from that city by the populace, he ventured to return to Mecca, where he preached so successfully to the assembled pilgrims that he gained a number of converts, and among them six inhabitants of *Yathreb*, afterwards named *Medinat al Nabi*, (city of the prophet), or simply *Medina*, who were of the Jewish tribe *Khazrai*. In the twelfth year, no less than twelve men of Medina came to Mecca, and by a solemn oath pledged themselves to adhere to Mohammed. On their return to Medina, accompanied by the preacher *Masáb*, the new religion was propagated so successfully at Medina, that a large part of the people became Mohammedans. The following year, which was the thirteenth of his mission, seventy-three converts of Medina came to Mecca, and entered into a covenant with Mohammed to protect and defend him by force of arms against all assailants. This was the first step towards the employment of the sword in support of his doctrine. He however dismissed them, and remained at Mecca with his few friends there. As soon as they were gone, all the tribes of Meccans banded together to assassinate him in his house. But he found means to escape out of the city, and to make his way to Medina. This was the famous flight of Mohammed, sixty-eight days after the commencement of the Arabic lunar year that began on Friday, July 16, 622, and which the Mohammedans called the year of the *flight* or the *Hégira*. Hitherto Mohammed had appeared only in the character of a prophet,—a character which he had sustained by a life of self-denial, purity, and devotion, as well as by ardent zeal to enlighten and reform his fellow-men. But he now assumed the character of a temporal sovereign as well as a prophet, and claimed to have absolute power in civil as well as religious matters. Arguments and entreaties were no longer the only means he used in making converts, but he pretended to have a command from God to propagate the truth and to suppress all false religions by the power of the sword. He accordingly led his followers to battle, waged offensive as well as defensive wars in support of his religion, and gave to idolaters no alternative but death or the profession of Islamism. In the course of eleven years he brought all Arabia under his dominion, and purged it of idolatry. He also gave himself up to excessive venery, and claimed to have divine permission to marry as many wives as he pleased, and whom he pleased, without regard to the laws which are binding on other men. Yet he continued to exhibit the same religious zeal as before, and seemed not at all sensible of any incongruity

between his pretensions and his conduct. He died at Medina in the year 632, while preparing to extend his conquests into foreign countries; and died, as he had lived, apparently with a self-approving conscience, and in the full persuasion that he had faithfully discharged the duties of his prophetic office, and was going to receive a rich reward.—See the writers mentioned in note (3), *supra*.—*Tr.*]

§ 3. No one can at this day form a perfect judgment of the entire character, views, and designs of *Mohammed*. For we cannot safely rely on the Greek writers, who made no hesitation to load their enemy with slanders and falsehoods; nor can we trust to the Arabians, who are the very worst historians, who conceal all his vices and crimes, and depict him as altogether a divine person. Besides, a very considerable part of his life, and that too from which the motives and secret springs of his conduct would best appear, lies concealed from us. It is very probable, however, that abhorrence of the superstition in which he saw his countrymen involved, so wrought upon him as to throw him into a disordered state of mind; and that he really believed, that he was divinely commissioned to reform the religion of the Arabs, and to reinstate among them the worship of the one true God. But it is also certain, that afterwards, when he saw his attempts going into successful operation, he deluded the fickle and credulous multitude with impious tricks and impositions, in order to strengthen his cause; and even feigned divine revelations, whenever occasion seemed to require it or any great difficulty occurred. Nor was this fraud inconsistent with his being a fanatic; for most fanatics look upon the deception which seems necessary to their success, to be holy and approved of God; and they of course resort to deception, when they can do it safely.(5) The religion which he inculcated, is not what it would have been if his designs had not been opposed. The pertinacity with which the Arabians adhered to the opinions and customs of their ancestors, and the hope of gaining over the Jews and the Christians to his cause, undoubtedly led him to approve and to tolerate many things which he would have rejected and abrogated if he had been at liberty to pursue his own choice.

§ 4. The causes of the rapid propagation of this new religion among so many nations, are not difficult to be discovered. In the first place, the terror of arms which *Mohammed* and his successors carried with great success into different countries, compelled vast multitudes to receive his law. In the next place, his law itself was admirably adapted to the natural dispositions of men, and especially to the manners, the opinions, and the vices prevalent among the people of the East; for it was extremely simple, proposing very few things to be believed; nor did it enjoin many and difficult duties to be performed, or such as laid severe restraints on the propensities of men.(6) Moreover, the consummate ignorance, which characterized

(5) This, in my judgment, is the best way of deciding the controversy, which has been agitated by learned men of our age; whether *Mohammed* was a fanatic or an impostor? See *Peter Bayle*, *Dictionnaire Historique*, tom. iii., article *Mahomet*, note K. *Sim Ockley*, *Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens*, tom. i., p. 68, Lond., 1708, 8vo. *George Sale*, *Preliminary Discourse to his translation of the Ko-*

ran, sec. ii., [p. 53, &c., ed. Lond., 1825. *Schroech*, *Kirchengesch.*, vol. xix., p. 380, &c.—*Tr.*]

(6) See *Hadr. Reland*, *de religione Mahumetica*, Libri ii., Utrecht, 1717, 12mo. *Geo. Sale*, *Prelim. Dissert. to the Koran*, sec. iv., v., vi. [*Han. More*, *Dictionary of all Religions*, art. *Mahometans*, ed. 1817. *H. Hallam's View of Europe in the middle ages*, vol. ii., p. 402, &c., ed. Philad., 1821.

for the most part the Arabians, the Syrians, the Persians, and other nations of the East, gave a bold and eloquent man easy control over the minds of immense numbers. We may add, that the virulent contests among the Christians—Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites, which filled a large part of the East with carnage and horrible crimes, rendered their religion odious in the eyes of many. And further the Monophysites and Nestorians, whom the Greeks oppressed most grievously, gave assistance to the Arabians and facilitated their conquest of certain provinces, and thus secured the preponderance to their sects in those regions.(7) Other causes will readily suggest themselves, to such as consider attentively the state of the world and the character of the Mohammedan religion.

§ 5. After the death of *Mohammed* in the year 632, his followers issuing forth from Arabia with their native fortitude stimulated by a furious fanaticism, and aided, as has already been observed, by those Christians who were persecuted by the Greeks, extended their conquests over Syria, Persia, Egypt, and some other countries.(8) Nor could the Greeks, harassed with intestine commotions and various wars, put forth sufficient energy to check their rapid career. The victors at first used their prosperity with moderation, and were very indulgent towards the Christians, especially to those who opposed the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon. But as is common with those enjoying uninterrupted success, they insensibly swerved from this moderation into severity, and so loaded the Christians with taxes and other burdens and injuries, that their condition more resembled that of slaves than of citizens.(8*)

Schroechh, Kirchengesch., vol. xix., p. 356, &c.—*Tr.*]

(7) See *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandr.*, p. 163, 169, [and *Gibbon*, *Decline and Fall*, &c., ch. li., where this is shown by the conduct of the *Copts*, or *Jacobites* in Egypt.—*Tr.*]

(8) See *Simon Ockley*, *Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt*, by the Saracens, vol. i., Lond., 1708, and vol. ii., Lond., 1717, 8vo; [also *Gibbon*, *Decline and Fall*, &c., ch. l., li.—*Tr.*]

(8*) [Mohammed framed the Koran to be the basis of civil government, as well as of religion, among his followers; and in all ages they have so regarded it till the present time. Church and state, religion and civil policy, are so united and blended by the Koran, that they cannot be separated, but must stand or fall together. And hence the permanence and unchangeable character of the Mohammedan religion, in all countries where it has become established. For to attempt to change the religion of a Mohammedan country, or even to convert any of its citizens, is to plot against the state,—it is high treason, and must be punished as such.—Mohammed united in his own person the two characters of an absolute monarch, and of a sovereign pontiff or high-priest; and the Koran made no provision for these two offices ever to be separated. At the same

time he named no one to succeed himself, nor pointed out the manner in which this complex office should descend from one person to another. Hence his ghostly empire was in imminent danger of dissolution at his death. But the religious enthusiasm of his followers preserved and perpetuated it. *Abubeker*, one of his fathers-in-law, was made *Kalif*, or successor to the prophet. After his death in 634, *Omar* held the kalifate till 644; then *Othman* till 655; then *Ali*, the son-in-law of Mohammed, till 661. These all reigned at Medina. In the year 661 Ali was assassinated, and soon afterwards his son *Hasan*; and *Moawiyah* of the family of *Omayyad*, who was governor of Syria, grasped the kalifate. He made Damascus the seat of empire; and his family reigned there as kalifs for 91 years, or till A.D. 752. Afterwards, the family of *Abbas* held the kalifate, and reigned at or near Bagdad till A.D. 934; when this empire of the Saracens, which had previously been dismembered, sunk altogether, and the Moslem countries fell under the dominion of various Mohammedan sovereigns, each absolute in his own dominions. It was under the kalifs who reigned at Medina and Damascus, or during the first century of Islamism, that the Saracens made the greater part of their foreign conquests. During his lifetime Mohammed demanded of the Persians, the Greeks, and other bordering

§ 6. The civil dissensions among the Mohammedans, which arose soon after the death of their prophet, were not a little injurious to the success of their enterprises. *Abubeker* the father-in-law, and *Ali* the son-in-law of *Mohammed*, had hard contention about the right to the throne, which each claimed to himself; and this controversy being handed down to posterity, divided the whole race into two great parties, separated not only by a difference in opinions and practices, but also by deadly hatred. The two sects are called, the one *Sonnites*, and the other *Shiites*.(9) The former contend that *Abubeker* was the true *Kalif*; the latter, that *Ali* was the legitimate *Kalif* or successor of *Mohammed*. Both regard the *Koran* as of divine origin, and as the authoritative rule in religion; but the *Sonnites* unite with it the *Sonna*, a sort of oral law, derived from *Mohammed*, and serving to explain the *Koran*; which the *Shiites* wholly discard. The Turks, Tartars, Africans, and most of the Indians, are *Sonnites*; the Persians and Mogores are *Shiites*; yet the Mogores seem to belong to neither sect.(10) Besides these two grand divisions, there are among the Mohammedans four principal sects and a great many subordinate ones, which contend sharply respecting various subjects in religion, yet practise mutual toleration.(11)

nations, to receive and obey his religion. He likewise sent an army, and at length marched himself with 10,000 troops, to make conquests on the confines of Palestine; but he failed of success. His successors vigorously prosecuted foreign conquests, by sending armies of enthusiastic Arabs under the command of able generals, who became the governors of the provinces they subdued. Syria and Palestine were conquered under *Abubeker* and *Omar*, by *Abu Abcidah*, *Caled*, and others, between the years 632 and 639. Egypt was subdued by the valiant *Amrou*, in the kalifate of *Omar*, A.D. 640; and Persia, Mesopotamia, and Armenia, about the same time. From Egypt the Saracens traversed the whole northern shore of Africa, but were half a century in bringing it under entire subjection. From Africa they passed into Spain in the year 709, under *Tarik* and *Musa*, in the kalifate of *Walid*, and completed their conquests there in the space of three or four years. The country beyond the *Oxus* in Asia, was conquered under the same kalif.—In most of their wars the Saracens were the assailants; and they offered no other excuse for declaring war, than their desire to propagate their religion. Hence, before they attacked any city or fortress, they proposed three things to the choice of the persons in it, either to embrace the Mohammedan religion, or to submit to tribute, or to be conquered and enslaved. The second proposition was not made to any pagans or idolaters, but only to Christians, Jews, Magians, and Sabians, or such as had books of real or pretended revelation. For the pagans, the only alternative was conversion or sla-

very and death. To such as embraced the first proposal, they granted at once all the privileges of fellow-citizens with themselves; and to those who preferred the second, they were generally faithful to perform their engagements. Those who preferred a resort to the sword, were treated with great cruelty when conquered. The men were generally butchered if they did not instantly become Mussulmans, and the women and children were made slaves. See the references in the preceding note.—*Tr.*]

(9) See *Adr. Reland*, de Religione Turcica, lib. i., p. 36, 70, 74, 85. *Joh. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, tom. ii., p. 236, &c.

(10) The principles of the *Sonnites* may be learned from the tract published by *Adr. Reland*, de Relig. Turcica, lib. i. The religion and opinions of the *Shiites* are clearly stated by *Joh. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, tome iv., the whole.

(11) On the Mohammedan sects, see *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*, Historia Orientalis, lib. ii., cap. vi., p. 340. *Ricaut*, Etat de l'Empire Ottoman, lib. ii., p. 242. *Jo. Chardin*, Voyages en Perse, tom. ii., p. 236. *Geo. Sale*, Preliminary Discourse to the *Koran*, sec. viii., p. 207, &c.—[The following account of the Moslem sects is abridged from *Sale*, ubi supra. The *Sonnites*, or believers in the traditions of *Mohammed*, are divided into four principal sects, which are accounted orthodox, and have their several oratories in the temple of Mecca. They derive their names from the celebrated doctors, whose dogmas they embrace: viz., 1. The *Hanefites*, so named from *Abu Hanifa* of Bagdad, who was born A.D. 699, and died in

767. These are distinguished from the other sects by adhering less to the traditions, and by making more use of reason in their discussions. Formerly they resided chiefly in Irak, but now they abound every where among the Turks and the Tartars.—II. The *Malchites* follow *Malec Ebn Ans* of Medina, who was born about A.D. 710, and died about 794. He was distinguished for the most scrupulous adherence to the traditions, and for extreme distrust of his own opinions. This sect abounds in Barbary and Africa.—III. The *Shafeites* follow *Mohammed Ebn Edris al Shafei*, who was born in Palestine A.D. 767, educated at Mecca, and died in Egypt A.D. 819. He was a well-educated man, an enemy of scholastic divinity, and the first who systematized the Mohammedan jurisprudence. His followers live chiefly in Arabia and Persia.—IV. The *Hanbalites* follow *Ahmed Ebn Hanbal* of Bagdad, who was born A.D. 780, and died A.D. 855. He was distinguished for his strictness in adhering to the letter of the law. About the year 924 his followers were very numerous at Bagdad, and so zealous against the use of wine and all joviality, that they would break into houses and disperse companies indulging themselves in wine and music. But edicts were published to restrain them, and they have dwindled to a few individuals living chiefly in Arabia.

The sects which the *Sonnites* account *heretical*, because they differ from themselves in points esteemed fundamental, are said to be seventy-three in number. Their heretical opinions relate principally to the metaphysical nature of the divine attributes, predestination, the sins of believers, and the offices of prophets and leaders of the faithful. According to their belief on these subjects, they may all be brought under the four following denominations, each embracing several minor sects or subdivisions.—I. The *Motazalites* or *separatists* originated from *Wasel Ebn Ata* of Basra, in the latter part of the seventh century. Their departure from Islam orthodoxy related chiefly to the following articles. (1) In regard to the divine attributes, the *Sonnites* held that God existed from eternity, clothed with various essential attributes, omniscience, omnipotence, &c.; but the *Motazalites*, in order to defend more effectually the doctrine of the divine unity, denied all eternal attributes, and predicated eternity of God's essence only. They said, God knows by his essence, and not by his knowledge; wills by his essence, and not by his will; and so of his other attributes. They were charged with divesting God of his attributes, in order to maintain his unity. (2) In regard to the

Koran, the *Sonnites* maintained that it was eternal and uncreated; but the *Motazalites* affirmed the contrary; and some of them said, if it were eternal it would be God, and then there would be a plurality of Gods.—(3) In regard to decrees and free agency, the *Sonnites* were rigid predestinarians; maintained the necessity of human actions, and denied free will to man; but the *Motazalites* denied absolute decrees, and maintained the doctrine of free will and of the contingency of human actions. (4) In regard to Moslem believers, the *Sonnites* held, that none of them would be condemned to everlasting punishment for their sins; but the *Motazalites* held, that if a Moslem were guilty of any grievous sin and died without repentance of it, he would be punished everlastingly, though less intensely than an unbeliever.—(5) The *Motazalites* denied all vision of God in paradise by the corporeal eyes.—On all these subjects the *Motazalites* held the general positions above stated, in opposition to the *Sonnites*; but they differed greatly among themselves in the exposition of their views, and thus became divided into more than twenty minor sects, named after the several doctors whom they followed.—II. The *Sefatians* or *attributists*, at first agreed entirely with the *Sonnites* as to the nature of the divine attributes, but afterwards they began to talk of a new class of attributes called declarative, because they are ascribed to God in narrations and declarations of his proceedings. They are such as hands, face, eyes, feet, &c. At first the *Sefatians* merely said, that these attributes were given to God in the Koran, and therefore they also affirmed them, but without explaining them. Afterwards, they adopted such explanations as seemed to make God a material and corporeal being. In regard to most of the other points in which the *Motazalites* differed from the orthodox, the *Sefatians* either took middle ground, or agreed more with the orthodox than with the *Motazalites*. Among themselves they were divided into five subordinate sects, some of which approximated to the views of Christians, and some advanced very gross and vulgar conceptions.—III. The *Kareyites* or *revolvers*, were the oldest of all the Mohammedan sects. In the 37th year of the Hegira, A.D. 658, when the Kalf *Ali* was contending with his rival *Moawiyah*, and after the battle of Seifein agreed to submit his cause to arbitration, 12,000 of his followers revolted from him, because he submitted a question to human decision, which should have been left to God alone to determine. Most of these were indeed slain in battle in the following year; but they

afterwards propagated their sentiments in Persia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia, and became considerably numerous, being divided into six or seven subordinate sects. Though differing in various other points, they all agreed in excluding both Othman and Ali from the list of true kalifs, in accounting every person who commits any grievous sin as really an infidel and to be treated as such, and in regarding it as an imperious religious duty to resist forcibly any Imam who deviates from the law. The first Karejites maintained, that any fit man, though not of the Koreish tribe, might be constituted Imam or prince of the faithful; that for malconduct, an Imam might be deposed and even put to death; and that it was not absolutely necessary there should be any Imam. As to *Ali*, they not only accused him of sin in submitting his cause to arbitration, but even pronounced him an infidel and accursed for this crime.—IV. The *Shiites* are the antipodes of the Karejites. They almost deify the true and legitimate kalifs; among whom they regard *Ali* as the first, and his posterity the only lawful successors. Yet they differ exceedingly on other points. Some are *Motazalites* in doctrine, others come near to the *Sonmites*, and so great is the diversity of their sentiments that they constitute a very great number of sects. Yet they all differ from the *Sonmites* in the following particulars. They hold *Abubeker*, *Omar*, and *Othman*, or the three first kalifs, to have been usurpers; they make *Ali* equal to *Mohammed* himself in merits and authority; they accuse the *Sonmites* of corrupting and disobeying the *Koran*; and they wholly reject the *Sonna* or book of traditions, as having no authority whatever.

Besides these numerous sects, heretical and orthodox, into which the Moslem community is divided, its repose has been disturbed by a series of pretenders to inspiration, who, like *Mohammed*, claimed to be prophets sent to restore religion to its pristine purity. Two of these were competitors with *Mohammed*, in his lifetime, viz., *Mosailama* and *Al Ashwad*. The former was of the tribe of *Honeifa* in the province of *Yamama*. In the year 629 he headed an embassy from his tribe to *Mohammed*, and professed himself a Moslem. But on his return home, he concluded to set up for a

prophet himself, and offered *Mohammed* to join in a partnership with him. His proposal was of course rejected; and *Mosailama* gathered numerous followers, but was slain in battle, with most of his adherents, by the *Mohammedans* under the intrepid *Caled*, A.D. 632. *Al Ashwad* was also an apostate *Mohammedan*, who set up for himself in *Yemen*, but was slain in his palace in the same year, and about the time of *Mohammed's* death. Other prophets and prophetesses started up about the same time, but were put down by the power of the kalifs. Nor has any long period passed from that time onward, without the appearance of some new prophet among the *Mohammedans*. The following are mentioned by *Salc* as the most noted in the earlier centuries. About A.D. 775 appeared *Hakem Ebn Hashem* of *Khorasan*, who arrogated to himself divine honours. In the year 816 appeared *Babec* in *Aderbijan*, who was with much difficulty subdued. About A.D. 849, one *Mahmud Ebn Faraj* pretended, to be *Moses* returned from the other world. About A.D. 891, the fanatical sect of *Karmatians* spread themselves in *Mesopotamia* and about *Cufah*, following one *Karmata* as their guide; who seems to have verily thought that he had divine revelations and was a prophet. After his death, other leaders of the sect pretended to have revelations. Subsequently, the kindred but more ferocious sect of *Ismaciens*, called by the crusaders *Assassins*, appeared in *Asia*, under an Imam said to be of the family of *Ali*; and about the year 1095 they spread themselves in the *Persian Irak*, where they were commanded by *Hasan Sabah* and his posterity during 170 years. The celebrated Arab poet *Abul Teyyeb Ahmed*, surnamed *Motanabbi*, who died A.D. 965, for some time laid claim to divine inspiration, and attracted followers, till the civil arm compelled him to renounce his pretensions and content himself with being a mere poet. In the year 1240, a Turkman named *Baba* set up for a prophet, at *Amasia* in *Natolia*. He gathered an army of 6000 horse, and made war upon all who would not say, There is no god but God, and *Baba* is the prophet of God. See *Salc's Prelim. Diss.*, sect. viii., p. 207–255; and *Sir Paul Rycant*, *Turkish History*, vol. ii., p. 61–66.—*Tr.*]

PART II.

THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

§ 1. State of Learning. The Monks its Patrons.—§ 2. Ignorance of the Bishops.—§ 3. History and other Sciences, corrupted.—§ 4. State of Philosophy.

§ 1. THE profound ignorance and barbarism of this century, will hardly appear credible to those who have not personally examined its literary productions. What little of learning and knowledge still remained, with a few exceptions, was confined to the cloisters of the monks, especially in the western or Latin church. The laws forbid any one to be made an *abbot*, unless he had some learning. The monks were required to devote certain hours to reading; and that they might derive greater profit from this exercise, they were required, in most monasteries, to converse together at stated times on what they had read.(1) It was their business also to educate young men destined for the sacred office. But all the institutions of this sort were of little service to the cause of learning and to the church; because very few had any just conceptions of the nature and utility of the liberal arts and sciences; and the majority were more intent on the perusal of worthless writers and the lives of saints, than on the study of valuable authors. The best among them studied the works of *Augustine* and *Gregory* the Great; and scraps gathered from these fathers, constitute the best productions of the Latin church in this century.

§ 2. Kings and noblemen were attentive to every thing rather than to the cause of learning. The rude and unlearned bishops suffered the schools, which had been committed to their care, to languish and become extinct.(2) It was very rare to find among them persons able to compose their own public discourses. Such of them as possessed some genius, garbled from *Augustine* and *Gregory* a parcel of jejune addresses, a part of which they kept for their own use, and the rest they imparted to their more dull and stupid colleagues, so that *they* also might have something to say. This is manifest from the examples of *Casarius* of Arles, and of *Eligius* of Noyon. There is likewise extant a Summary of Theology, which was unskilfully compiled by *Tajo* of Saragossa, from the writings of *Augustine* and *Gregory*; and this insipid performance was so highly esteemed, that the other bishops did not hesitate to pronounce its author *the true salt of the earth*, and a *divine luminary* in the church.(3) Many such proofs of the ignorance of the times may be easily collected, by any

(1) *Jo. Mabillon*, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict., tom. ii., p. 479, 513, et passim.

(2) Hist. litt. de la France, par les Moins Benedict. Sept. Siecle, tom. iii., p. 428, &c.

(3) *Jo. Mabillon*, Analecta veteris aevi, tom. ii., p. 77.

one disposed to examine the writers of this century. England however was in a happier state, in this respect, than the other countries of Europe : for *Theodorus*, a Cilician and bishop of Canterbury, of whom more will be said hereafter, introduced into that country some attachment to letters and learning.(4)

§ 3. The Greeks who attempted to write either poetry or in prose, obscured very plain and simple subjects, by their tumid and fustian style. The style of the Latins, with a few exceptions, was so base and corrupt that it was not even capable of the same fault. History was wretchedly degraded and perverted, both by the Greeks and the Latins. Among the former *Moschus*, *Sophronius* and others, and among the latter *Braulio*, *Jonas* an Hibernian, *Audoenus* or *Dado*, and *Adamannus*, have transmitted to us biographies of several saints, which are insipid and ridiculous, and destitute alike of an air of probability and of elegance of composition. The Greeks led the way in committing to writing the floating traditions concerning the more ancient times, without discrimination ; and hence originated those medleys of fables, which the Latins afterwards so greedily caught up and retained.

§ 4. Philosophy, among the Latins, was at an end. Those who were unwilling to neglect it altogether, were satisfied with committing to memory a few words and sentences taken from *Boethius* and *Cassiodorus*. For they were not disposed to reason on the subject, and they were unable to consult the Greeks, from ignorance of their language. The Greeks, abandoning *Plato* to certain of the monks, betook themselves to *Aristotle* ; whose precepts were nearly indispensable in the theological contests of the age with the Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites, for all these resorted to the Stagyrte for aid whenever they were called to the combat. Hence *James* of Edessa, a Monophysite of this century, translated *Aristotle's* *Dialectics* into Syriac.(5)

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE TEACHERS, AND OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

- § 1. Disputes about Pre-eminence between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople.—
 § 2. The former opposed by many.—§ 3. Vices of the Clergy.—§ 4. State of the Monks.
 —§ 5. Greek Writers.—§ 6. Latin Writers.

§ 1. THE contest for pre-eminence between the Roman and Constantinopolitan prelates, had gained such a height in this century, that we may clearly discern the commencement of that unhappy schism which afterwards separated the Latins from the Greeks. It is commonly asserted, and by men of the greatest learning and best acquainted with ancient history, that the Roman pontiff, *Boniface* III., prevailed on that abominable tyrant *Phocas*, who, after murdering the emperor *Mauritius*, mounted the

(4) *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britanniae*, tom. i., p. 42. *Herm. Conringius*, *Antiquitates Academicæ*, p. 277.

(5) See *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. i., p. 498.

imperial throne, to divest the bishop of Constantinople of the title of *æcumenical bishop*, and to confer it on the Roman pontiff. But this is stated solely on the authority of *Baronius*; (1) for no ancient writer has given such testimony. Yet *Phocas* did something analogous to this, if we may believe *Anastasius* and *Paul Diaconus*. (2) For whereas the bishops of Constantinople had maintained, that their church was not only fully equal to that of Rome but had precedence of all other churches, *Phocas* forbid this, and determined that the priority of rank and dignity should be given to the church of Rome.

§ 2. The Roman pontiffs used indeed every means to retain and to enlarge the power and dignity which they had acquired; yet the history of this period affords many proofs, not only that emperors and kings but that nations also, resisted those attempts. Various proofs of the superiority of the regal power in religious matters, and even over the pope himself, may be collected from the Byzantine history, and from the *Formulas* of *Marculfus*. The Roman writers indeed tell us, that *Constantine Pogonatus* formally relinquished the right of confirming the election of a Roman pontiff; and they cite *Anastasius* as a witness, who states that *Pogonatus* ordered that a Roman pontiff elect should be ordained forthwith and without delay. (3) But this testimony does not reach the point to be proved. It appears however to have been the fact, that this emperor in the time of the pontiff *Agatho*, remitted the customary payment to the court of a sum of money for the confirmation of a pontifical election. (4) The ancient Britons and Scots could not be moved, for a long time, either by the threats or the promises of the papal legates, to subject themselves to the Roman decrees and laws; as is abundantly testified by *Beda*. (5) The

(1) [*Baronius*, *Annales*, ad ann. 606, No. 2.—*Schl.*]

(2) *Anastasius*, de *Vitis Pontificum*, (Bonifacius III.). *Paulus Diaconus*, de *Rebus gestis Longobardorum*, lib. iv., cap. 37, in *Muratorii*, *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. i., part i., p. 465. [*Anastasius* says, that “whereas the church of Constantinople had claimed to be the first of all the churches, *Boniface* obtained from the emperor *Phocas*, that the Romish church, the apostolic seat of the blessed apostle *Peter*, (*caput esset omnium ecclesiarum*), should be the head of all the churches.” *Paul Diaconus* says: “This emperor *Phocas*, at the request of pope *Boniface*, decreed that the see of the Roman and apostolic church should be the first, (*primum esse*), whereas the Constantinopolitan had before assumed to be the first of all.”—By being the first and the head, both the bishops of Constantinople and the usurper *Phocas* seem to have understood merely priority of rank, and not that supreme authority and dominion which the Roman pontiffs afterwards claimed. It was intended as a compliment; but it was construed into a grant of unlimited power. See *Boicer's Lives of the Popes*, (*Boniface III.*), vol. ii., p. 546, &c., ed. Lond., 1750.—*Tr.*]

(3) *Anastasius*, de *Vitis Pontif.* (Bene-

dict), in *Muratorii*, *Scriptor. rerum Italicarum*, tom. iii., p. 146. [The words of *Anastasius* are: concessit, ut persona, quae electa fuerit in sedem Apostolicam, e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinaretur. That is, it should not be necessary to write to Constantinople, but merely to obtain liberty from the emperor's vicegerent, the exarch of Ravenna, previously to the ordination. More-over history shows, that succeeding emperors did not respect this privilege.—*Schl.*]

(4) *Anastasius*, de *Vitis Pontif.* (*Agatho*), p. 144. Compare *Jo. Ja. Mascov*, *Historia Germanorum*, tom. ii., note, p. 121, &c. [According to *Anastasius*, the emperor did not wholly remit, but only diminish the amount of the payment; *relevata est quantitas*, quae solita est dari; and this too, with the express injunction that the ancient rule should be observed, and that no ordination should take place, till the consent of the emperor should be obtained from court. See *Boicer's Lives of the Popes*, (*Agatho*), vol. iii., p. 131, &c., ed. Lond., 1754.—*Tr.*]

(5) [*Beda*, *Hist. Eccles.*, l. ii., c. 2, l. iii., c. 25.—*Schl.* The case of *Wilfrid* bishop of York, who being deposed and banished by the Saxon king in 678, appealed to Rome, and returned acquitted, but was imprisoned nine months, and then banished the king-

Gauls and the Spaniards, as no one can deny, attributed only so much authority to the pontiff, as they supposed would be for their own advantage.(6) Nor in Italy itself, could he make the bishop of Ravenna and others bow obsequiously to his will.(7) And of private individuals, there were many who expressed openly their detestation of his vices and his greediness of power. Nor are those destitute of arguments who assert, that the Waldenses even in this age had fixed their residence in the valleys of Piedmont, and inveighed freely against Roman domination.(8)

§ 3. That the bishops of inferior rank and all who were intrusted with sacred offices, as well those in the monasteries as those without, lived in the practice of many enormities, is expressly admitted by every writer of any note in this century. Every where simony, avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, insolence to the people at large, and even vices worse than these, might be seen reigning in the places consecrated to holiness and virtue.(9) Between the monks and the bishops, many pertinacious quarrels existed in different places. For the latter laid their greedy hands on the rich possessions of the monks, that they might support their own luxury. And the monks feeling this very sensibly, first applied to the emperors and kings, and not finding *their* protection adequate, resorted to the Roman pontiff.(10) He therefore readily took them under his care, and gradually

dom, is a strong case in point. See *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, (Agatho), vol. iii., p. 98-105.—*Tr.*]

(6) [It is well known, that the French kings often deposed bishops, whom the popes by all their efforts were not able to restore; and that in Spain, *Julianus* the bishop of Toledo, freely censured pope *Benedict* II. for sending into Spain his disapprobation of a synodic letter, and accused his holiness of ignorance, negligence, and jealousy. Yet this *Julianus* is a canonized saint. See the 15th council of Toledo, in *Harduin*, Concil., tom. iii., p. 1761, &c.—*Schl.*]

(7) *Mich. Geddes*, Miscellaneous Tracts, vol. ii., p. 6, &c., [and *Muratori*, Hist. of Italy, vol. iv., p. 157; where is a diploma of the emperor *Constantine* IV., in which he releases *Maurus* archbishop of Ravenna, from obedience to the pope. At his death this archbishop warned his clergy not to subject themselves to the Roman pontiff, but to apply to the emperor for a pall for the new archbishop. And to the present time the archbishops claim a kind of independence of the Romish see. Even the abbot *St. Columbanus* defends the ancient Irish manner of keeping Easter, against the popes, with great intrepidity, and likewise the subject of the three Chapters, and this, at the instigation of king *Agilulph*. He maintains that *Vigilius* was not watchful enough, and that the pope ought to purge the seat of St. Peter from all errors, from which it was not now free. See his five Epistles, in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Lugd., tom. xii., p. 1, &c.—*Schl.*]

(8) *Anton. Leger*, Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises, lib. i., p. 15, &c., [and *Spanheim*, Introduct. plen., tom. ii., p. 598, &c.—*Schl.*]

(9) [Thus we read of *Desiderius* a nobleman, that he assumed the garb of a beggar, and conducted *Brunechild*, who was expelled the court of Theodebert, in safety to the court of Burgundy. At her solicitation, her faithful conductor was advanced to the bishopric of Auxerre; (*Daniel*, History of France, vol. i., p. 351 of the German translation); a worthy candidate for the episcopal office! To the *simony* of the clergy, the national synod of Toledo, A.D. 653, can. 3, bears testimony: to their *avarice*, the provincial synod of Merida in Spain, (*Harduin*, tom. iii., p. 997); to their *violence*, the council of Braga, A.D. 675, where they were forbidden to inflict blows. In the same year, a council at Toledo commanded the clergy to read the Bible, on pain of excommunication, (*Harduin*, tom. iii., p. 1017), and required every new bishop to make oath, that he had neither paid nor promised to pay money for his bishopric. Even the papal chair was not free from simony. To the *pious frauds* must be reckoned the multitude of fables, which were enviously fabricated. Quite a collection of them is exhibited by *Dr. Semler*, Historiæ Eccles. selecta Capita, tom. ii., p. 55, &c., 60, &c.—*Schl.*]

(10) See *Jo. Launoi*, Assertio inquisitionis in Chartam immunitatis S. Germani; Opp., tom. iii., part i., p. 50, &c. *Baluze*, Miscellan., tom. ii., p. 159, tom. iv., p. 108. *Muratori*, Antiquit. Italicarum tom. ii., p. 944, 949, &c.

exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks, in return, defended the interest of the pontiff as if it were their own; and they recommended him as a sort of God to the ignorant multitude, over whom their reputed sanctity gave them great influence. That these *exemptions* of the monks were the cause of many of their vices and disorders, is admitted by several of the best writers.(11)

§ 4. In the mean time the monks, from the favour of the pontiff and their display of fictitious piety, were every where making surprising progress, especially among the Latins. Parents eagerly consecrated their children to God, with good portions of their property made over to the monasteries; that is, they devoted them to what was esteemed the highest bliss on earth, a life of solitude.(12) Those who had spent their lives in guilty deeds, hoped to expiate their crimes, by conferring the greater part of their property on some company of monks. And immense numbers impelled by superstition, robbed their heirs of their richest possessions in order to render God propitious to them through the prayers of monks. Rules for monastic life were drawn up by *Fructuosus*, *Isidorus*, *John Gerundinensis*, *Columbanus*, and others among the Latins;(13) for the *Rule* prescribed by *St. Benedict* was not as yet become the universal and the only rule.

§ 5. Among the writers, few can be named who possessed much genius or erudition. The best among the Greeks were the following: *Maximus*, a monk, who contended fiercely against the Monothelites, and wrote some explanatory works on the scriptures, was by no means destitute of native talent; but he was a man of a violent spirit, and in that respect unhappy.(14) *Isychius* bishop of Jerusalem, expounded some books of Scripture, and has left us a few *Homilies* and other minor works.(15) *Dorothe-*

(11) See *Jo. Launoï*, *Examen privilegii S. Germani*; *Opp.*, tom. iii., part i., p. 282. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i., p. 43, 44, 49, &c.

(12) *Gereais*, *Histoire de l'Abbé Suger*, tome i., p. 9-16.

(13) *Lucas Holstenius*, *Codex Regular*, tom. ii., p. 225, &c.

(14) [*Maximus* was born of noble parentage at Constantinople, about A.D. 580. The emperor *Heraclius* made him his secretary, and intended he should write the civil history of his times. But the emperor falling into the heresy of the Monothelites, which *Maximus* abhorred, either disagreement between them or the propensity of *Maximus* to a monkish life, led him to retire from court and take residence in a monastery at Chrysopolis near Constantinople. Here *Maximus* became the abbot. Before the year 640, the prevalence of Monothelitic principles or the political quietudes of the country, led him to travel. He went to Egypt, where he had warm disputes with the principal Monothelites. In the year 645 he went to Rome, and enjoyed the intimacy of pope *Martin I.* In 653 the emperor *Constantin II.*, who was a Monothelite, caused him to be arrested and brought to Constantinople, to be tried for seditious conduct. He

was acquitted; but refusing to promise silence in the controversy then raging with the Monothelites, he was banished to Thrace and confined in different places till the year 662, when he died in the castle of Schemra, on the confines of the Alans. His collected works, published, Gr. and Lat., by *Fran. Combefis*, Paris, 1675, 2 vols. fol., consist of about fifty small treatises, answers to Biblical questions, polemic and dogmatic tracts, moral and monastic pieces, and letters. Besides these, he has left us Commentaries on the Canticles, on *Dionysius Areopagita*, and on some parts of *Gregory Nyssen*. He is an inelegant, obscure, metaphysical and mystical writer, yet learned and zealous.—*Tr.*]

(15) See *Rich. Simon*, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiast. de M. du Pin*, tom. i., p. 261. [*Hesychius* or *Isychius*, first a presbyter, and then bishop of Jerusalem, flourished about A.D. 601. A Commentary on *Leviticus* in vii. books, is extant in a Latin translation; about which there has been much discussion, whether it was a production of this *Hesychius* or of some other. See *Labbe*, *Dis. Historica*, de *Bellarmin*, de *Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*, p. 227, &c., ed. Venice, 1727. The works of *Hesychius*, which are extant in Greek, are, Arguments to the twelve Minor Prophets and *Isaiah*; two

us, an abbot in Palestine, acquired fame by the *Ascetic Dissertations*, with which he would instruct monks how to live.(16) *Antiochus*, a monk of St. Sabas in Palestine, composed a *Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*, that is, Institutes of the Christian religion, a work of no great merit.(17) *Sophronius*, bishop of Jerusalem, acquired the veneration of after ages, by his conflicts with those reputed in his day as heretics, especially with the *Monothelites*.(18) He was evidently the cause of the whole Monothelite controversy. *Andreas* of Crete has left us several *Homilies*, which are neither truly pious, nor eloquent, and which some therefore suspect were falsely ascribed to him.(19) *Gregory Pisides*, a Constantinopolitan deacon, besides a *History of Heraclius and of the Avars*, composed a few poems and other short pieces.(20) *Theodorus of Raitlu* is author of a book against

hundred Sentences on temperance and virtue; seven Homilies; a Life of St. Longinus; an Introduction to the book of Psalms; and a Comment. on Ps. 77-107, and 118. He also wrote an Eccles. History, and some other Commentaries, which are lost. See *Cave*, Hist. Lit., tom. i., p. 571, &c.—Tr.]

(16) [*Dorotheus* probably lived about A.D. 601. He wrote twenty-four ethical and ascetic dissertations, (*διδασκαλίαι seu Doctrinae, de vita recte et pie instituenda*), and several Epistles; which are extant, Gr. and Lat., in the *Orthodoxographia*, and in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuarium, tom. i.—Tr.]

(17) [*Antiochus* flourished A.D. 614, and was alive in 629. His *Pandecte divinae Scripturae*, or Compendium of the Christian religion and of the holy scriptures, comprised in 130 *Homilies*, is extant in *Fronto Ducaeus*, Auctuarium, tom. i. He also wrote *de vitiosis Cogitationibus liber*, and *de Vita S. Euphrosyni*.—Tr.]

(18) See the *Acta Sanctor.*, tom. ii., Martii, ad diem xi., p. 65. [*Sophronius* was a native of Damascus, and for some time a sophist or teacher of philosophy and eloquence. He afterwards became a monk in Palestine; and in this character he sat in the council of Alexandria held by *Cyrus* the patriarch of that see, in the year 633, for the purpose of uniting the Monothelites and the Catholics. Here *Sophronius* zealously opposed the 7th of the nine propositions which *Cyrus* wished to establish. From Alexandria he went to Constantinople, to confer with *Sergius* the patriarch of that see on the subject. Soon after, he was made patriarch of Jerusalem, and wrote his long Epistle or Confutation of the Monothelites, addressed to *Honorius* the Roman pontiff and to the other patriarchs. But his country was now laid waste. The Saracens having conquered all the northern parts of Syria, laid siege to Jerusalem in 637. The city capitulated to the Kalif *Omar*, who entered Jerusalem, treated *Sophronius* with much respect, promised him and the Christians safety and

the free exercise of their religion, and having given orders for erecting the mosque of Omar on the site of the temple, retired to Arabia. *Sophronius* died a few months after, in the same year. His works are, the Epistle or Dissertation above mentioned, four Homilies, an account of the labours and travels of the apostle Paul, the Life of St. Mary an Egyptian, and a tract on the Incarnation. The best account of him and his writings is said to be that of *J. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Gr., vol. viii., p. 199, &c. See *Cave*, Hist. Lit., tom. i., p. 519.—Tr.]

(19) [*Andreas* was a native of Damascus, became a monk at Jerusalem, a deacon at Constantinople, and at last archbishop of Crete. His age is not certain, but he was contemporary with *Sophronius* of Jerusalem, A.D. 635, and lived some years after. *Fr. Combefis* published, as his works, Paris, 1644, in fol., Gr. and Lat., seventeen Homilies, nine Triodia, Canons or church Hymns, and several shorter Hymns adapted to different festivals. He afterwards published three more Homilies, and some poems, in his Auctuar. Nov., tom. i. and ii. A *Computus Paschalis*, ascribed to *Andreas*, was published, Gr. and Lat., by *Dionysius Petavius*, de Doctrina Tempor., tom. iii. The genuineness of some of these pieces is suspected.—Tr.]

(20) [*Gregory*, or rather *George*, of Pisida, was first a deacon and chartophylax of the great church of Constantinople, and then archbishop of Nicomedia. He flourished about A.D. 640; and has left us *Cosmopoieia*, an iambic poem on the Hexæmeron, now in 1880 lines; and another poem in 261 iambic lines, on the vanity of life; both published by *Morel*, Paris, 1585, 4to. Three others of his poems, (Eulogy of Heraclius, on his Persian wars, and the assault of the Avars on Constantinople), were promised to the public by *Claud. Maltret*; but they were not published. *Schroeckh*, Kircheng., vol. xix., p. 106, &c. *Cave*, Hist. Lit., i., p. 583.—Tr.]

those sects which were considered as corrupting Christianity by their doctrines concerning the person of *Jesus Christ*. (21)

§ 6. The most distinguished Latin writers were the following : *Ildefonsus* of Toledo, to whom the Spaniards falsely ascribe certain treatises concerning the Virgin *Mary*. (22) Two Books of Epistles by *Desiderius*

(21) [*Theodorus*, a presbyter in the Laura Raithu, in Palestine, flourished A.D. 646, and wrote a short treatise on the incarnation of Christ, in opposition to the heresies of *Manes*, *Apollinaris*, *Theodorus Mopsuest.*, *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, *Julian Halicar.*, *Severus*, and others. It is extant, Gr. and Lat., in *Fronto Ducaeus*. Auctuarium, tom. i., and in Latin, in the Biblioth. max. Patr., tom. viii.—Tr.]

[The following Greek writers of this century are passed over by *Dr. Moshcim*, viz. :

John Malala, a native of Antioch who probably flourished about A.D. 601. He wrote *Historia chronica*, from the creation to the death of *Justinian I.* A.D. 565, which was published, Gr. and Lat., by *Humphr. Hody*, Oxon., 1691, 8vo. See *Cæcæ*, Hist. Littér., i., p. 568, &c.

About the same time lived *Eusebius* bishop of Thessalonica, *Conon* an opposer of *John Philoponus*, and *Themistius* surnamed *Calonymus*; all polemic writers on the side of the Catholics. But only fragments of their essays and epistles have reached us, in *Photius* and the Acts of Councils.

Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople A.D. 608–639, was a favourer of the Monothelite doctrine, and instigator of the famous Ecthesis of *Honorius*. He has left us three Epistles, extant in the Concilia, tom. vi.

Cyrus, bishop of Phasis A.D. 620, and patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 630–640. He held a synod at Alexandria in 633, in which he proposed a *Libellus satisfactionis* in nine chapters, designed to unite the Theodosians or Severians to the Catholics. But his 7th chapter or position, containing the doctrine of the Monothelites, was opposed, and led to fierce contests. He also wrote three Epistles to his friend *Sergius* of Constantinople. All these are extant in the Concilia, tom. vi.

Theophylactus Simocatta, an Egyptian, a sophist, and a prefect, who flourished A.D. 611–629. He wrote *Historiæ rerum Mauritiio gestarum libri viii.*, from the year 582 to 602, edited, Gr. and Lat., Ingolst., 1603, 4to, and Paris, 1648, fol.; also 85 short Epistles, (inter *Epistolas Græcænicas*, Aurel. Allobrog., 1606, fol), and *Problema physica*, Gr. and Lat., Antw., 1598, 8vo.

Georgius, an abbot in Galatia A.D. 614, wrote the life of his predecessor *Theodorus*; in *Surius* and other collectors of pious lives.

George, patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 630–630. He wrote the life of *John Chrysostom*, which is published with *Chrysostom's* works.

About the year 630, that valuable but anonymous work, called the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, *Pastus Sieuli*, and *Chronicon Paschale*, was composed, perhaps by *George Pisides*, or by *George* Patr. of Alexandria. It extends from the creation to A.D. 628. The best edition is that of *Du Fresne*, Paris, 1689, fol.

John Moschus, *Eviratus*, or *Eueratus*, a monk of Palestine who flourished A.D. 630, after travelling extensively, wrote his monkish history entitled *Pratum spirituale*, *Hortulus novus*, *Limonarium*, and *Viridarium*, extant in *Fr. Ducaeus*, Auctuar., tom. ii., and in *Cotelier*, Monum. Eccl. Gr., tom. ii.

Thalassius, abbot of a monastery in Libya about A.D. 640, wrote several tracts, namely, de sincera Charitate, de Vitæ continentia et mentis regimine, sententiarum Hecaton-tadas iv., extant in Lat. in the Biblioth. max. Patr., tom. xii., and Gr. and Lat. in *Fr. Ducaeus*, Auctuar., tom. ii.

Theodorus, bishop of Pharan in Arabia, near Egypt, a Eutychian and Monothelite controversial writer, from whose tracts large extracts are given in the Acts of the Lateran and 6th councils; Concilia, tom. vi.

John, archbishop of Dara in Syria, who has been placed in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries, and perhaps lived about A.D. 650, wrote Commentaries in Syriac, on the works of *Dionysius Arcopagita*, and on the Apocalypse; extracts from which have been published by *Abr. Ecchellens.*, *Jno. Morin*, and *F. Nairon*.

Basil, bishop of Thessalonica, say some, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, say others, and who flourished perhaps A.D. 675, wrote *Scholia* on fifteen Orations of *Gregory Nazianzen*.

Mucarius a Monothelite, patriarch of Antioch about A.D. 680, whose Confession of Faith, and extracts from other works, are extant, Concilia, tom. vi.

John, archbp. of Thessalonica A.D. 680, has left us one Oration, part of another, a fragment of a Hymn, and parts of a Dialogue between a pagan and a Christian.—Tr.]

(22) See the Acta Sanctor. Januarii, tom. ii., p. 535. [*Ildefonsus* was nobly born at Toledo, educated at Seville, and after being

of Cahors, were edited by *Hen. Canisius*.(23) *Eligius* of Limoges, has left us some *Homilies*, and other productions.(24) The *two books of Ecclesiastical Formulas*, by *Marculphus* a Gallic monk, help us much to discover the wretched state of religion and learning in this age.(25) The Englishman *Aldhelm* composed with no great success, various poems on subjects relating to a Christian life.(26) *Julianus Pomerius* confuted the Jews, and has left us some other specimens of his genius, which are neither to be highly praised nor utterly contemned.(27) To these may be added *Cresconius*.(28) whose *Abridgment of the Canons* is well known, *Fredegarius*.(29) and a few others.(30)

a monk and abbot at Agli, became archbishop of Toledo A.D. 657-667. His ten spurious homilies and discourses, and one spurious tract concerning the virgin *Mary*, with one genuine tract on the same subject, were published by *Feuardentius*, Paris, 1576, and afterwards in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii. We have from his pen a tract on the ecclesiastical writers, in continuation of *Jerome*, *Gennadius*, &c., two *Epistles*, and a tract de cognitione Baptismi. Several other tracts and letters, and a continuation of *Isidore's* Gothic History, are lost.—*Tr.*]

(23) [*Desiderius* was treasurer to *Clothair II.* A.D. 614, and bishop of Cahors in France A.D. 629-652. His *First Book of Epistles* contains those which *Desiderius* wrote to his friends, the *second* contains those addressed to him. They are extant in *Canisius*, *Lectio. Antiquæ*, tom. v., and in *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. viii.—*Tr.*]

(24) [*Eligius* was born near Limoges, became a goldsmith there, and was esteemed the best workman in all France. In 635, king *Dagobert* sent him as ambassador to Brittany. While a layman, he erected several monasteries and churches. He was bishop of *Noyon* A.D. 640-659, and still continued to found monasteries and churches, and also laboured to spread Christianity among the Flemings, the Frieslanders, and the Swabians. He has left us a tract de rectitudine Catholicæ conversationis, (which has been ascribed to *Augustine*), and an *Epistle* to *Desiderius* of Cahors. Of the sixteen *Homilies* ascribed to him, and extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii., the greatest part, if not the whole, are supposed to be spurious. They are compilations from the fathers, and several of them bear marks of the ninth and tenth centuries.—*Tr.*]

(25) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii., p. 565. [About the year 660, *Marculphus*, then seventy years old, at the request of the bishop of Paris compiled this book of formulas of different instruments and writings used in ecclesiastical courts, and elsewhere, in the transaction of ecclesiastical affairs and in the management of church property. It

was published, Paris, 1665, 4to, and 1667 by *Baluze*, in *Capitull. Regum Francor.*, tom. ii., p. 369.—*Tr.*]

(26) ["This prelate certainly deserved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by *Dr. Mosheim*. His poetical talents were by no means the most distinguishing part of his character. He was profoundly versed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared also with dignity in the *Paschal* controversy, that so long divided the Saxon and British churches. See *Collier's Eccles. Hist.*, vol. i., p. 121."—*Macl. Aldhelm* was grandson to *Ina* king of the West Goths. When young he travelled over Gaul and Italy, and pursued study with such ardour that he became one of the most learned men of the age. Returning to England, he lived first as a monk, and then for thirty-four years as the abbot of *Malmesbury*; afterwards, he was bishop of *Sherburne* A.D. 705-709. *Beda* (lib. v., c. 19) says, he was *undecunque doctissimus*. While abbot, he wrote by request of an English synod, a book in confutation of the sentiments and practice of the ancient Britons and Scots in regard to Easter; which is now lost. He also wrote a tract in praise of virginity, both in prose and in verse; likewise a Book on the eight principal virtues; and 1000 verses of Enigmas. These and some other poems were published at Mayence, 1601, 8vo, and in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xiii.—*Tr.*]

(27) [*Julianus Pomerius* was bishop of Toledo A.D. 680-690. He wrote commentaries on *Joshua*; a demonstration that *Christ* has come, against the Jews, in three Books; on death, the place of departed souls, the resurrection and final judgment, three Books; on the discrepancies in the Scriptures, two Books; a history of king *Wamba's* expedition against *Paul*, the rebel duke of *Narbonne*; and an Appendix to *Ildesonus de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* His works are in the twelfth vol. of the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*—*Tr.*]

(28) [*Cresconius* was an African bishop, and flourished A.D. 690. His *Breviarium*

Canonum, is a methodical Index to the canons of councils and decrees of the Roman pontiffs, digested under 300 heads. He afterwards wrote *Concordia seu Liber Canonum*, which is the same thing, except that the canons and decrees are here recited at length. Both works are in *Voellus*, and *Jussell's* Biblioth. Juris Canon.—*Tr.*]

(29) *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, vol. iii., p. 506. [*Fredgaricus* Scholasticus was a Gallic monk, who flourished A.D. 640. He compiled a Chronicle, from the creation to the year of Christ 641, in five Books. The three first Books, which reach to A.D. 561, are a compilation from *Julius Africanus*, *Eusebius* as translated by *Jerome*, and others. The fourth Book, comprising A.D. 561–584, is an abridgment of *Gregory Turonensis'* History of the Franks. The fifth Book, from 584 to 641, was composed by *Fredgaricus*. The Chronicle was afterwards continued by other hands to A.D. 768. The fifth Book is published among the *Scriptores rerum Francicar.* The other Books are partly in *Canisius*, *Lectiones Antiq.*, tom. ii., and partly in *Gregory Turon.*, *Histor. Francor.*—*Tr.*]

(30) [The following catalogue embraces the Latin writers omitted by *Dr. Mosheim*.

Paterius, pupil of *Gregory the Great*, and bishop of *Brescia* about A.D. 601. He wrote a Collection of Scripture testimonies, in three Books; two from the Old Test. and one from the New:—published with the works of *Gregory the Great*.

Faustus, a monk brought up by *St. Benedict*, and sent into Gaul with *St. Maurus*. He wrote, A.D. 606, the life of *St. Maurus*; and the life of *St. Severinus*. Both are extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. i.

Marcus, a disciple and companion of *St. Benedict*, and versifier of the life of *Benedict* by *Gregory the Great*: fl. A.D. 606.

Boniface IV., pope A.D. 606–615, has left us an epistle to king *Ethelbert* of Kent; and a Synodic Decree: in the *Concilia*, tom. v.

Bulgaranus, a Spanish Goth and count, A.D. 610. Six of his Epistles still preserved, have been often consulted but never published.

Sisebutus, a Gothic king in Spain A.D. 612–621. Several of his Epistles are preserved; and likewise his life and martyrdom of *St. Desiderius*.

Boniface V., pope A.D. 620–626. His Epistle to *Justus* bishop of *Rochester*, another to *Edwin* king of *Northumberland*, and a third to *Edilburg*, *Edwin's* queen, are extant in *Baronius*, *Annales*, ad ann. 618 & 625; also in the *Concilia*, tom. v.

Nennius, a British monk and abbot of *Bangor*, about A.D. 620, and often confounded with the Irish *Gildas*. He wrote *de Gestis Britonum Liber*, sive *Breviarium*, or a *History of the Britons*; the MS. of which is still preserved at *Westminster* and at *Cambridge*. See *Cave*, *Hist. Lit.*, tom. i., p. 620.

Honorius, pope A.D. 626–638. He was a *Monothelite*. Eight of his Epistles, which fully prove the fact, are extant in the *Concilia*, tom. v. See *Joh. Forbes*, *Instruct. Hist. Theolog.*, lib. v., and *Schroeckh*, *Kircheng.*, vol. xx., p. 401, 442, &c., 446, &c.

Braulio, bishop of *Saragossa* A.D. 627–646. He wrote the life of *St. Aemilian* a monk, which is in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. i.; also two Epistles to *Isidore* *Hispal.*, and a short Eulogy of *Isidore*, which are published with the works of *Isidore*.

Jonas, an Irish monk, and abbot of *Luxueil*, flourished about A.D. 630. He wrote the Lives of *St. Columbanus* *Bobienensis*, of *Eustasius* abbot of *Luxueil*, of *Attala* abbot of *Bobio*, of *Bertulph* abbot of *Bobio*, of *St. John* the founder and abbot of a monastery, and of *St. Fara* or *Burgundofara* first abbot of *York*. Most of these lives are in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Benedict.*, tom. ii.

Cummianus or *Comminus*, surnamed *Fata* or *Fada*, i. e., tall, son of *Fiacna* the king of west *Momonía* in *Ireland*; born A.D. 592, died 661. He was a monk, abbot, and some add bishop in *Ireland*; and wrote an Epistle to *Seignus*, abbot of *Hy*, on the paschal controversy, (in *Usher's* *Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicar.*, p. 24), and a book *de poenitentiarum mensura*, which is in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii.

John IV., pope A.D. 640–641. He wrote an Epistle to the Scotch bishops, concerning the paschal controversy; another to the emperor *Constantine III.*, in apology for pope *Honorius*; and a third to *Isaac*, bishop of *Syracuse*. These are extant in the *Concilia*, tom. v.

Audocus or *Dado*, archbishop of *Rouen* A.D. 640–683. He lived to the age of 90, and wrote the life of *St. Eligius* of *Noyon*, in iii. Books; published, imperfect, by *Sirius*; and perfect, by *L. Dachier*, *Spicileg.*, tom. v.; also an Epistle.

Theodorus I., pope A.D. 642–649. He has left us two Epistles; in the *Concilia*, tom. v., and in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii.

Eugenius, archbishop of *Toledo* A.D. 646–657. He composed some tracts in verse and prose, which are extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii.

Tajo or *Tago*, bishop of Saragossa, flourished A.D. 646. He was a great admirer of the works of *Gregory* the Great; went to Rome to obtain copies of them; and compiled five Books of *Sentences* from them.

Martin I., pope A.D. 649–655. For his opposition to a decree of the emperor *Constantians*, called his *Typus*, *Martin* was seized by an armed force in 653, carried prisoner to Constantinople, kept in jail a long time, tried, and banished. He ended his days at Cherson, an exile. Seventeen of his *Epistles* are extant; 11 of them, Gr. and Lat., are in the *Concilia*, tom. vi.

Anastasius, deacon and apocrisarius of the Romish church. He adhered to *St. Maximus*, and shared in his fortunes. The year before his death, A.D. 665, he wrote a long letter, giving account of the sufferings and exile of himself, *Maximus*, and *Anastasius* patriarch of Constantinople, and defending their tenets in opposition to the Monothelites. It is in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xii., and also prefixed to the works of *St. Maximus*.

Fructuosus, of royal Gothic blood, bishop of Braga A.D. 656–675. He was founder of many monasteries, and particularly that of Alcala, and drew up two *Rules* for monks, one in twenty-three chapters, the other in twenty. Both are published by *Lu. Holstenius*, *Codex Regular.*, pt. ii.

Vitalianus, pope A.D. 657–671. In the year 668, he and *Maurus* the archbishop of Ravenna, mutually excommunicated each other. Six of his *Epistles* are in the *Concilia*, tom. vi.

Syricius, bishop of Barcelona about A.D. 657. He wrote two *Epistles*, which are extant in *Lu. Dachier*, *Spicileg.*, tom. i., or new ed., tom. iii.

Cummencus, surnamed *Albus*; an Irish monk, and abbot of Hy A.D. 657–669. He wrote the life of *St. Columba*, the first abbot of Hy; which may be seen in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. i.

Jonas, a disciple of *St. Columbanus*, and an abbot somewhere. He wrote about A.D. 664, the life and miracles of *St. John*, abbot Reomaënsis, in ii. Books. The latter Book is in *Mabillon*, *Acta*, &c., tom. i.

Theodorus, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, whom the pope made archbishop of Canterbury A.D. 668. He was a man of learning, and very efficient in action. Introducing a fine library of Greek and Latin works into

England, he gave an impulse to learning among the Anglo-Saxon clergy. He also did much to bring the British and Scotch clergy to adopt the Roman method of keeping Easter. His only work, except an epistle, is his *Poenitentiale*, or directory for dealing with offenders in the church.

Agatho, pope A.D. 680–681, has left us three *Epistles*; which are in the *Concilia*, tom. vi.

Adamnanus or *Adamannus*, a Scotch-Irish monk, and abbot of Hy A.D. 679–704. He was very active in bringing the Scotch and Irish to adopt the Roman practice respecting Easter. His life of *St. Columbanus*, in three Books, is given by *Canisius* and *Surius*; and his topographical description of Jerusalem and other sacred places, as he learned them from *Arculphus* a Gallic bishop and traveller, in three Books, was published by *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, sæcul. iii., pt. ii., or tom. iv., p. 456–472.

Coolfrid, abbot of Weremuth or Wiremuth, in England, about A.D. 680, and preceptor to *Beda*. He visited Rome, obtained of pope *Sergius* privileges for his monastery, and brought home books for the use of his monks. A long *Epistle* of his to *Naiton*, king of the Picts, in defence of the Roman method of keeping Easter, is extant in *Beda*, l. v., c. 22, and in the *Concilia*, tom. vi.

Aphonius, very little known, but supposed to have lived about A.D. 680, wrote a Commentary on the Canticles, in vi. Books; which is extant in the *Biblioth. max. Patr.*, tom. xiv.

Valerius, a Spanish monk and abbot in Galicia about A.D. 680. His life of *St. Fructuosus*, is extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. ii. Some other lives and treatises exist in MS.

Leo II., pope A.D. 682–684. Five *Epistles* ascribed to him, are extant in the *Concilia*, tom. vi. But *Baronius* and others think them spurious, because they represent pope *Honorius* to have been a Monothelite.

Benedict II., pope A.D. 684–686. He has two *Epistles* in the *Concilia*, tom. vi.

Bobolenus, a monk and presbyter, who probably lived about A.D. 690. He wrote the life of *St. Germanus*, first abbot Grandvallensis in the bishopric of Basle, who was slain about A.D. 666; extant in *Mabillon*, *Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. ii. —*Tr.*]

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

§ 1. Miserable state of Religion.—§ 2. Expositors of the Scriptures.—§ 3. Dogmatic Theology.—§ 4. Practical Theology.—§ 5. Renewal of Penitential Discipline.—§ 6. State of Polemic Theology.

§ 1. DURING this century true religion lay buried under a senseless mass of superstitions, and was unable to raise her head. The earlier Christians had worshipped only God and his Son; but those called Christians in this age worshipped the wood of a cross, the images of holy men, and bones of dubious origin.(1) The early Christians placed heaven and hell before the view of men; these latter talked only of a certain fire prepared to burn off the imperfections of the soul. The former taught that *Christ* had made expiation for the sins of men, by his death and his blood; the latter seemed to inculcate, that the gates of heaven would be closed against none who should enrich the clergy or the church with their donations.(2) The former were studious to maintain a holy simplicity, and to follow a pure and chaste piety; the latter placed the substance of religion in external rites and bodily exercises. Did any one hesitate to believe? Two irrefragable arguments were at hand; *the authority of the church*, and *miracles*, for the working of which in these times of ignorance but a moderate share of dexterity was requisite.

§ 2. Few either of the Greeks or Latins, applied themselves to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. There remain some commentaries

(1) I will here quote a passage, well calculated to illustrate the piety of this age, taken from the Life of *St. Eligius* bishop of Noyon, in *Lu. Dachier's* *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.*, tom. ii., p. 92. "The Lord conferred upon this most holy man, among other miraculous gifts, that, while searching and praying after them with the most ardent faith, the bodies of the holy martyrs which had lain concealed for so many ages, were discovered." This most successful carcass-hunter of saints, therefore, discovered the bodies of *Quintin, Piato, Crispin, Crispinian, Lucian*, and many others; as his biographer minutely narrates. Such ability to find the concealed bones of saints and martyrs, was claimed by most of the bishops who wished to be esteemed by the people and to amass riches.

(2) *St. Eligius*, a great man of this age, says, (in *Dachier*, *Spicilegium*, tom. ii., p. 96), "He is a good Christian who comes often to church, and brings his offering to be laid on the altar of God; who does not taste of his produce till he has first offered some of it to God; who, as often as the holy so-

lemnities return, keeps himself for some days before pure even from his own wife, so that he may come to the altar of God with a safe conscience; and who finally has committed to memory the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer. —Redeem your souls from punishment, while ye have the means in your power—present oblations and tithes to the churches, bring candles to the holy places, according to your wealth—and come often to the church, and beg suppliantly for the intercession of the saints. If ye do these things, ye may come with confidence before the tribunal of the eternal God, in the day of judgment, and say: Give, Lord, for we have given." ["We see here a large and ample description of the character of a good Christian, in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or justice, benevolence, and charity towards men; and in which the whole of religion is made to consist in coming often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in consecrated places, and such like vain services."—*Macl.*]

of *Isychius* of Jerusalem, on certain books of the Old Testament, and on the epistle to the Hebrews. *Maximus* composed *sixty-five questions on the Holy Scriptures*, and some other works of like character. *Julianus Pomerius* showed his wish and his inability to reconcile passages of Scripture between which there is apparent contradiction, and also to explain the prophecy of Nahum. Compared with these writers, the worst of modern interpreters are manifestly to be preferred. The Greeks, especially those who would be thought adepts in mystic theology, ran after fantastic allegories; as may be seen by the *Questions* of *Maximus* above mentioned. The Latins had too little self-confidence even to venture on such a course, and therefore only culled flowers from the works of *Gregory* and *Augustine*; as is manifest, among other works, from the *Explanations of the Old and New Testament* collected by *Paterius* from the works of *Gregory* the Great.(3) *Thomas* of Heraclea gave to the Syrians a new translation of the New Testament.(4)

§ 3. As among the Latins philosophy was nearly extinct, and among the Greeks only certain points of theology were brought under discussion, no one thought of reducing the doctrines of religion to a regular system and of stating them philosophically. Yet one *Antiochus*, a monk of Palestine, composed a short summary of religious doctrines, which he called *the Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. But the rank and influence due to this author, may be inferred from the mournful verses subjoined to this work, in which the author deplores in sorrowful strains the loss of the wood of the [true] cross, which the Persians were said to have carried away. Of the Latin theology of this age, a more neat and judicious summary has not come down to us than that in *Ildefonsus'* book *de Cognitione Baptismi*, lately brought to light by *Baluze*;—a work indeed which *we* do not need, but one that contains some valuable testimonies for truths which were afterwards discarded.(5) *Tajo* or *Tago*, bishop of Saragossa, compiled *five books of sentences*, which are a dry and insipid body of theoretical and practical divinity taken from *Gregory* the Great, though *Augustine* is sometimes taxed for contributions; yet that age esteemed it an admirable performance, and deserving immortality.(6) On certain parts of Christianity, a few individuals employed their pens; as *Maximus*, who wrote *on theology*, and *on the manifestation of the Son in the flesh*, and likewise *on the two natures in Christ*; and *Theodoros* of Raithu, who wrote *on the incarnation of Christ*. But those acquainted with the character of that age, will easily conjecture what sort of doctors these were.

§ 4. The lamentable state of practical theology, is manifest from every writer on the subject in this age. The best of them were, *Dorotheus* in

(3) This useless performance has been usually printed with the works of *Gregory* the Great; and therefore the Benedictine monks inserted it in their recent and splendid edition of *Gregory's* works, vol. iv., pt. ii., but with no advantage to the public.

(4) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Orient. Vatican., tom. ii., p. 93, 94.

(5) See *Baluze*, Miscellanea, tom. vi., p. 1, &c. From this book it clearly appears, among other things, that the doctrine of *transubstantiation* as it is called, was unknown to the Latins in the 7th century, (ch.

137, p. 99)—that the sacred volume was read by all Christians, (ch. 80, p. 59)—and other facts of the like nature. *Ildefonsus* carefully excludes philosophy and reason as authorities in religion; and teaches that there are but two sources of theology, namely, the holy scriptures and the writings of the ancient doctors, or as he expresses himself (p. 14, 22), *divinae institutionis auctoritatem*, et *sacrae paternitatis antiquitatem*.

(6) See *Jo. Mabillon*, *Analecta veteris Aevi*, tom. ii., p. 68, &c.

his Ascetic Dissertations, *Maximus* and *Aldhelm* in some tracts, *Hesychius* and *Thalassius* in their Sentences, and a few others. But in them how many and how great the defects! how numerous the marks of superstition! what constant indications of a mind vacillating and unable to grasp the subject! The laity as they were called, had no cause to tax their teachers with excessive severity; for it was customary to confine the obligations of men to a very few virtues, as is manifest from *Aldhelm's* tract on the eight principal vices. And those who disregarded these few duties, were to incur no very formidable punishment for their neglect. A life of solitude as practised by the monks, though adorned by no marks of true piety, was esteemed sufficient of itself to atone for all kinds of guilt; and it was therefore called by the Latins a *second Baptism*.⁽⁷⁾ This one fact is sufficient to show how little the precepts of *Christ* were understood in this age. Among the swarms of Greek and Oriental monks, very many laboured to attain perfection by means of contemplation; and these endeavoured to transfuse into their own souls the spirit of *Dionysius*, that father of the Mystics.

§ 5. *Theodorus* the Cilician being a Grecian monk, restored among the Latins the discipline of *penance* as it is called, which had fallen into neglect, and enforced it by strict rules borrowed from the Grecian ecclesiastical jurisprudence. This man being unexpectedly raised to the see of Canterbury in England, A.D. 668, among many other laudable deeds, reduced to a regular system that part of ecclesiastical law which is called *disciplina penitentiaria*. For by publishing his *Penitential*, a kind of work such as the Latin world had never before seen, he taught the priests to discriminate between more heinous and lighter sins, and between such as are secret and such as are open, and likewise to measure and estimate them according to the circumstances of time, place, the character and disposition of the sinner, his sorrow, &c., and pointed out the punishment due to the several kinds of sins and faults, the proper modes of consoling, admonishing, and absolving, and in short, marked out the whole duty of those who hear confessions.⁽⁸⁾ This new discipline of penance, though it was of Grecian origin, was very acceptable to the Latins; and in a short time it was diffused from Britain over the whole Latin world, and enforced by other Penitentials drawn up after the pattern of the original one by *Theodorus*. Yet it gradually declined again in the eighth century, and was at length wholly subverted by the new law of what are called *indulgences*.

§ 6. Those who wrote against the religious sects which departed from the common faith, are scarcely worthy of being named; and they would not be worth reading, were it not that they serve to elucidate the history

(7) [See in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 1771, the Capitula of *Theodore* of Canterbury, where we read: *At the ordination of monks* the abbot ought to say mass, and utter three prayers over his head, and the monk should veil his head with a cowl seven days; and on the 7th day the abbot should remove the veil from the monk's head. As in baptism the presbyter removes the infant's veil on the 7th day, so should the abbot do to the monk; for it is a *second baptism*, ac-

cording to the decision of the fathers, and all sins are forgiven, as in baptism.—*Schl.*]

(8) The *Penitential* of *Theodorus* is still extant, though mutilated; published by *Ja. Petit*, Paris, 1679, 4to, with learned Dissertations and notes. We have also the one hundred and twenty Capitula ecclesiastica of the same *Theodorus*, in *Dachier*, *Spicilegium*, tom. ix. *Harduin*, *Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 1771, and elsewhere.

of their times. Against the pagans, *Nicias* composed two Books;(9) and *Photius* mentions a person unknown to us, who he says contended against them with a great array of arguments drawn from the fathers.(10) Against the Jews contended *Julianus Pomerius*. All the heresies are described and assailed in the little work of *Timotheus* on the Reception of Heretics. Of the theological contests among the orthodox themselves, little can be said. In this age were scattered the seeds of those grievous contests, which afterwards severed the Greeks from the Latins; nor were they merely scattered, but likewise took root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman domination appeared altogether insufferable. In Britain, the ancient Christians of the country contended with the new or Romish Christians, namely, those of the Saxon race, whom *Augustine* converted to *Christ*. They contended respecting various things, as baptism, and the tonsure, but especially about the time for the celebration of the feast of Easter.(11) But these controversies did not relate to religion itself; and they were settled and determined in the eighth century, by the Benedictine monks, and in accordance with the views of the Romans.(12)

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF RITES AND CEREMONIES.

§ 1. Rites Multiplied.—§ 2. Some Examples.

§ 1. IN the council which is called *Quinisextum*, the Greeks made various enactments respecting religious rites and forms of worship, in which there were several deviations from the Roman usage. These canons were publicly received in all the churches within the territories of the Greek emperors, and likewise by all churches which accorded in doctrine and worship with the Greeks, though situated in the dominions of barbarian kings.(1) Nearly all the Roman pontiffs likewise, added something new to the ancient ceremonies; as if they had supposed that no one could teach Christianity with success, unless he could delight a Christian assembly with rare shows and mummeries. These rights and usages were in the time of *Charlemagne*

(9) [Of this man, nothing more is known than that he was a monk, and that he wrote a book against the seven chapters of *Philoponus*.—*Schl.*]

(10) *Photius*, *Bibl. Codex clxx.*, p. 379.

(11) *Cunmannus'* Epistle, in *Ja. Usher's* Sylloge epistolar. Hibernicar., p. 23, &c. *Beda*, *Historia Eccles. gentis Anglor.*, lib. iii., c. 25. *Dav. Wilkins*, *Concilia magnae Britann.*, tom. i., p. 37, 42. *Acta Sanctor. Februarii*, tom. iii., p. 21, 84. [See also *Dr. Warner's* Ecclesiastical History of England, book ii. and iii.—*Macl.*]

(12) *Jo. Mabillon*, *Praef. ad Acta Sanctor. ord. Bened.*, tom. iii., p. ii., &c.

(1) [This council was held at Constantinople A.D. 692, and was composed chiefly of Oriental bishops, of whom more than 200 were assembled. The place of the sessions was a hall in the imperial palace, called *Trullus*; whence the council was denominated *Concilium Trullanum*, and *Concilium in Trullo*. It was properly the seventh general council, and supplied canons for the church, which the fifth and sixth had neglected to make. Being thus a kind of supplement to the fifth and sixth general councils, it was called *Concilium Quinisextum*. See chap. v., § 12, below.—*Tr.*]

propagated from Rome among the other Latin churches; for the arrogance of the Roman pontiffs would not suffer any of the western churches to deviate from the Roman usage.

§ 2. A few specimens may serve for examples. The number of festivals, which was already oppressively great, was increased by the addition of a day consecrated to the wood of the cross on which the Saviour hung; (2) and another to the commemoration of his ascent to heaven. (3) *Boniface* V. invested the churches with those rights of asylum, which afforded to all villains a license to commit crimes without much danger. (4) The art of ornamenting churches magnificently, *Honorius* laboured most earnestly to bring to perfection. (5) For as neither *Christ* nor his apostles had enjoined any thing on this subject, it was but reasonable that their vicar should con-

(2) [This festival was instituted by the emperor *Heractius* in the year 631, after he had vanquished the Persians and recovered from them the real cross, which *Cosroes* their king had carried off fourteen years before. The festival was established by pope *Honorius*, and was introduced into the West in this century. For the Roman pontiffs were then under the dominion of the Greek emperors, and afterwards began gradually to withdraw themselves from their jurisdiction. The earliest mention of this festival, which the Greeks call *γαιροφάνεια*, [and the Latins *exaltatio crucis*, kept Sept. 14. See *Baronius*, *Annales*, ad ann. 628.—*Tr.*], occurs in the *Collatio* of *St. Maximus* with *Theodosius*, bishop of *Cæsarea* A.D. 650. See *Baumgarten's* *Erläuterung* der christl. *Alterthümer*, p. 310.—*Schl.*]

(3) [It is to be wished, that *Dr. Mosheim* had here given his authority for placing the origin of the feast of Ascension in this century. Among the 50 days next following Easter, this festival had been observed by the Christians with peculiar solemnity, ever since the fourth century; as may be inferred from *Augustine*, *Epist.* 118, ad Januar. *Chrysostom*, *Homil.* 62, tom. vii., and *Homil.* 35, tom. v. *Constitutiones Apostol.*, l. viii., c. 33, l. v., c. 19, and especially from the *Concil. Agathense*, A.D. 506, where the 21st Canon says: *Pascha, Natale Domini, Epiphania, Ascensionem Domini, Pentecosten et natalem S. Johannis Baptistæ, vel si qui maximi dies in festivitatis habentur, non nisi in civitatibus aut in parochiis teneant.* (*Harduin*, tom. ii., p. 1000.) Instead of this festival, we might mention the *Feast of All Saints* as originating in this century, under pope *Boniface*. In the eastern churches it had indeed been observed ever since the 4th century, on the 8th day after Whitsunday, and was called the *Feast of all the Martyrs*. But in the western churches it had the following origin: *Boniface* in the year 610 obtained by gift the Pantheon at Rome, and consecrated it to the honour of the virgin

Mary and all the martyrs, as it had before been sacred to all the gods, and particularly to *Cybele*. On this occasion he ordered the feast of all the apostles to be kept on the 1st of May, which was afterwards assigned only to *Philip* and *James*, and the feast of all the martyrs on the 12th of May. But this last feast being frequented by a large concourse of people, *Gregory IV.* in the year 834 transferred it to a season of the year when provisions were more easily obtained, that is, to the first day of November, and also consecrated it to *All Saints*. See *Baumgarten's* christl. *Alterthuemer*, p. 313.—*Schl.*; and *Gieseler's* *Text-book*, by *Cunningham*, vol. ii., p. 60, n. 11.—*Tr.*]

(4) [Temples were anciently among the pagans, places of safety for valuable goods, and for men in times of war or oppression. Among the Christians, at first only the altar and the choir enjoyed this privilege. Afterwards the nave of the church, and finally the whole enclosure participated in it. All persons under prosecution, whether in civil or criminal causes, might there be secure till their case was investigated. But public debtors, Jews, runaway slaves, robbers, murderers, banditti, and adulterers, were prohibited by law from this right of sanctuary. Yet in the western churches, this right of asylum degenerated into a source of the most shocking disorders, and to these disorders this regulation of *Boniface* especially gave occasion. *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* says of him: *He ordained, that no person who had taken refuge in a church, should be delivered up.*—*Schl.*]

(5) [See *Anastasius*, in his *Life of this pontiff*. He says of him among other things, that he covered the *Confessional of St. Peter* with pure silver, which weighed 187 pounds. He overlaid the great doors at the entrance of the church, which were called *Medianæ*, with silver weighing 975 pounds. He also made two large silver candlesticks, of equal dimensions, weighing each 62 pounds. He likewise made for the church of *St. Andrew*,

fer this favour on mankind. Of the sacerdotal garments, and the rest of the apparatus which was deemed necessary in the celebration of the Lord's supper, and for giving dignity and grandeur to the assemblies for public worship, I shall say nothing.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF HERESIES.

§ 1, 2. Remains of the Earlier Sects.—§ 3. Nestorians and Monophysites.—§ 4. Monothelites.—§ 5. Their prosperous Circumstances.—§ 6. Their Adversities.—§ 7. Contests arising out of the *ἐκθεσις* and the *τύπος*.—§ 8. The Sixth General Council.—§ 9. Sum of the Controversy.—§ 10. Different Opinions among that Sect.—§ 11. Their Condition after the Council of Constantinople.—§ 12. The Council called *Quinisextum*.

§ 1. THE Greeks, during this century and especially in the reigns of *Constans*, *Constantine* Pogonatus, and *Justinian* II., were engaged in fierce combat with the *Paulicians*, whom they considered as a branch of the Manichaeans, and who lived in Armenia and the adjacent countries. The Greeks assailed them not so much with arguments, as with military force and with legal enactments and penalties. It was during the reign of *Constans* that one *Constantine* resuscitated this sect, then exhausted and ready to become extinct, and propagated its doctrines with great success.(1) But the history of the sect, which is said to have originated from two brothers, *Paul* and *John*, will be stated more explicitly under the ninth century, at which time its conflicts with the Greeks came to an open and bloody war.

§ 2. In Italy, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the *Arians* to the doctrines of the Nicene council. In Gaul and in England, the *Pelagian* and *Semipelagian* controversies still produced some disquietude. In the East the ancient sects, which the imperial laws had repressed but had by no means subdued and extinguished, assumed courage in several places and were able to secure adherents. Fear of the laws and of punishment induced these sects to seek a temporary concealment, but when the power of their foes was somewhat abridged they again resumed courage.

§ 3. The condition of the *Nestorians* and *Monophysites*, under those new lords of the East the Saracens, was far happier than before that conquest; indeed, while the Greeks were oppressed and banished, both these sects were every where preferred before them. *Jesujabas* the sovereign pontiff of the Nestorians, concluded a treaty first with *Mohammed* and afterwards with *Omar*, by which he obtained many advantages for his sect.(2) There is likewise extant an *injunction*, or *Testament* as it is commonly called, that is, a diploma of *Mohammed* himself, in which he promises full security to all Christians living under his dominion: and though

a silver table before the Confessional, as above, which weighed 73 pounds, &c.—*Schl.*]

(1) *Photius*, contra Manichaeos, lib. i., p. 61. *Peter Siculus*, *Historia Manichaeor.*,

p. 41, &c. *George Cedrenus*, *Compend. Histor.*, p. 431, ed. Venice.

(2) *Jos. Sim. Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticana*, tom. iii., part ii., p. xciv, &c.

some learned men doubt the authenticity of this instrument, yet the Mohammedans do not call it in question.(3) The successors of *Mohammed* in Persia, employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs and business both of the court and of the provinces; nor would they suffer any patriarch, except the one who governed this sect, to reside in the kingdom of Babylon.(4) The Monophysites in Egypt and Syria were equally fortunate. In Egypt, *Amrou* having taken Alexandria in the year 644, directed *Benjamin* the Monophysite pontiff to occupy the see of Alexandria; and from that time for nearly a century, the Melchites, or those who followed the opinions of the Greek church, had no prelate.(5)

§ 4. Among the Greeks who were otherwise greatly distracted, there arose a new sect in the year 630, during the reign of *Heraclius*, which soon produced such commotions that both the East and the West united to put it down. An ill-timed effort at peace produced war. The emperor *Heraclius*, considering the immense evils resulting to the Greek empire from the revolt of the Nestorians to the Persians, was exceedingly desirous of reconciling the *Monophysites* to the Greek church, lest the empire should receive a new wound by their departure from it. He therefore, during his war with the Persians, first had a conference in the year 622 with one *Paul* a principal man among the Armenian Monophysites, and afterwards in the year 629, at Hierapolis, with *Anastasius* the *Catholicus* or patriarch of the Monophysites, respecting the means of restoring harmony. Both of them suggested to the emperor, that the believers in one nature of *Christ* might

(3) This famous *Testament* of Mohammed was brought into Europe from the East, in the 17th century, by *Pacificus Scaliger* a Capuchin monk; and was first published, Arabic and Latin, by *Gabriel Sionita*, Paris, 1630; and afterwards the Lutherans, *John Fabricius* A.D. 1638, and *Huicelmann* A.D. 1690, published it in Latin. See *Jo. Henr. Hottinger*, *Histor. Oriental.*, lib. ii., c. 20, p. 237. *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. iii., part ii., p. xciv. *Renaudot*, *Histor. Patriarchar. Alexandr.*, p. 168. Those who with *Grotius* reject this Testament, suppose it was fabricated by the monks living in Syria and Arabia, to circumvent their hard masters the Mohammedans. Nor is the supposition incredible. For the monks of Mount Sinai formerly showed a similar edict of *Mohammed*, which they said he drew up while a private man; an edict exceedingly favourable to them, and beyond all controversy fraudulently drawn up by themselves. The fraud was sufficiently manifest; yet the Mohammedans, a people destitute of all erudition, believed it was a genuine ordinance of their prophet, and they believe so still. This imposition is treated of by *Demetr. Cantimir*, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tome ii., p. 269, &c. The argument therefore which *Renaudot* and others draw in favour of the *Testament* in question, from the acknowledgment of its authenticity by the Mohammedans, is of little weight; be-

cause, in things of this nature no people could be more easily imposed upon than the rude and illiterate Mohammedans. Nor is the argument of more force, which the opposers of the *Testament* draw from the difference of its style from that of the *Koran*. For it is not necessary to suppose that *Mohammed* himself composed this Testament; he might have employed his secretary. But however dubious the *Testament* itself may be, the subject matter of it is not doubtful. For learned men have proved, by powerful arguments, that *Mohammed* originally would allow no injury to be offered to the Christians, and especially to the Nestorians.—[This Testament is a formal compact between *Mohammed* on the one part, and the Nestorians and Monophysites on the other. He promises to them his protection; and they promise to him loyalty and obedience. He promises them entire religious freedom; and they promise him support against his enemies. *Mohammed* might have deemed it sound policy to conclude such a treaty with these sectaries; that, by their aid, he might subdue the countries of Asia subject to the Greek emperors.—*Schl.*]

(4) *Asseman*, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*, tom. iii., part ii., p. xevii., &c. *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.*, p. 163, 169.

(5) *Euseb. Renaudot*, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor.*, p. 168.

be induced to receive the decrees of the council of Chalcedon and be reconciled to the Greeks, provided the Greeks would admit and profess, that *in Jesus Christ, after the union of the two natures, there was but one will and one voluntary operation.* *Heraclius* stated what he had learned from these men, to *Sergius* the patriarch of Constantinople, who was a native of Syria and descended from parents that were Monophysites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that it might be held and inculcated, without prejudice to the truth or to the authority of the council of Chalcedon, that, after the union of two natures in *Christ*, there was but one will and one operation of will. *Heraclius* therefore, in order to terminate the discord both in church and state, issued a decree, in the year 630, that this faith should be received and taught.(6)

§ 5. At first the affair seemed to go on well. For although some refused to comply with the imperial edict, yet the two patriarchs of the East, *Cyrus* of Alexandria and *Athanasius* of Antioch, did not hesitate to obey the will of the emperor; and the see of Jerusalem was then vacant.(7) The consent of the Latin patriarch or the Roman pontiff was perhaps not deemed necessary, in an affair which related so exclusively to the Oriental church. *Cyrus*, whom the emperor had promoted from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, assembled a council, by the seventh decree of which the doctrine of *Monothelism*, which the emperor wished to have introduced, was solemnly confirmed.(8) And this modification of the decree of Chalcedon was so influential with the Monothelites in Egypt, Armenia, and other provinces, that a great part of them returned to the church. They seem however to have explained the doctrine of *one will* in *Christ*,—which was certainly equivocal, according to their own views, and not according to the general sentiments of their sect.

§ 6. But this fair prospect of union was blasted, and a formidable contest was excited by a single monk of Palestine named *Sophronius*. He being present at the council of Alexandria held by *Cyrus* in the year 633, strenuously resisted the article which related to *one will* in *Christ*. And the next year, (634), being made patriarch of Jerusalem, he assembled a council in which he condemned the *Monothelites*, and maintained that by their doctrine, the *Eutychian* error respecting the amalgamation and confusion of natures in *Christ*, was revived and brought into the church. He

(6) The writers who give account of this sect, are enumerated by *Jo. Alb. Fabricius*, Biblioth. Græca, vol. x., p. 204. The account which I have given in the text is derived from the original sources, and rests on the most explicit testimony. [The most important of the ancient documents are found in the Acts of the council of the Lateran A.D. 649, and in those of the sixth general council, held at Constantinople A.D. 681, 682. Among the modern writers, the most full and candid is *Dr. Waleh*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix., p. 3–667. See also *Schrocekh*, Kircheng., vol. xx., p. 386–453, and *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, from *Honorius* on to the end of this century.—*Tr.*]

(7) See *Le Quien*, Oriens Christianus, tom. iii., p. 264.

(8) [The documents of this council are in *Harduin's* Concilia, tom. iii., p. 1327, &c. The intention of *Cyrus* was good. He wished to unite the Severians and the Theodosians, who composed a large part of the Christians of Alexandria; and he considered the doctrine of *one will* and *one operation* as the best means for this end. He therefore, in several canons, spoke of *one single theandric operation* in *Christ*, (ἑὴν θεογενῆτα τὰ θεοπροπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μὴ θεανδρικὴ ἐνεργεία), yet for the sake of peace, he refrained from affirming either *one* or *two wills* and *operations*. This step, though taken with the best intentions, gave occasion afterwards to the most violent theological contests.—*Schl.*]

drew over many, particularly among the monks, to his sentiments; and he made special efforts to gain over *Honorius* the Roman pontiff to his side.(9) But *Sergius* of Constantinople wrote a long and discreet letter to *Honorius*, which induced him to decide, that those held sound doctrine who taught that there was *one will* and *one operation* in Christ.(10) Hence arose severe contests, which divided the commonwealth as well as the church into two parties.

§ 7. To quiet these great commotions, *Heraclius* published in the year 639, an *Ecthesis*, i. e., a formula of faith, drawn up by *Sergius*, in which, while he forbid all discussion of the question whether there were *only one*,

(9) [*Sophronius* was most sincere and decorous in his opposition to the doctrine of *Monothelism*. In the council of Alexandria he fell down before *Cyrus*, and entreated him not to sanction such a doctrine. But he was alone in his opposition. *Cyrus* treated him tenderly, advised him to confer with *Sergius* the patriarch of Constantinople on the subject, and wrote a letter to *Sergius* for *Sophronius* to carry. When arrived at Constantinople, *Sergius* endeavoured to sooth him, represented the point as unessential, agreed to write to *Cyrus* not to allow any controversy on the subject, but to leave every one at full liberty to speculate as he pleased about it. *Sophronius* now agreed to keep silence. But when made patriarch of Jerusalem, his conscience would not let him rest. Whether he assembled a provincial synod, as *Dr. Mosheim* asserts, is questionable. But his circular epistle to the other patriarchs on occasion of his consecration, contained an elaborate discussion of the subject, and a host of quotations from the fathers, in proof that the doctrine of *two wills* and *two operations* was the only true doctrine. See the letter in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 1257.—*Tr.*]

(10) This the adherents to the Roman pontiffs have taken the utmost pains to disprove, lest one of the pontiffs should seem to have erred in a matter of such moment. See, among many others, *Jo. Harduin*, de Sacramento altaris, in his *Opp. selecta*, p. 255, &c. And indeed, it is not difficult either to accuse or to excuse the man. For he appears not to have known what to think on the subject, and to have annexed no very definite ideas to the words which he used. Yet he *did* say that there was but *one will* and *one operation* of will in Christ. And for this he was condemned in the council of Constantinople. He was therefore a *heretic*, beyond all controversy, if it be true that universal councils cannot err. See *Ja. Benig. Bossuet*, Defensio declarationis quam clerus Gallicanus, Anno 1682, de potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit, pt. ii., lib. xii., cap. 21, &c., p. 182, &c. Add *Ja. Basnage*, Histoire de

l'Eglise, tom. i., p. 391, &c. [*Honorius* was made acquainted, by *Sergius* in the above mentioned letter, with the origin and whole progress of the controversy; and such was his impression, that, in his answer to *Sergius*, (which is in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 1319, &c.), he so far agreed with *Sergius* as to disapprove the affirmation of either *one* or *two operations* and *divine wills*; yet he did very clearly maintain but *one will* in Christ, expressed his disapprobation of *Sophronius*, and declared the whole controversy to be unimportant and mere logomachy. There is extant also, (ibid., p. 1351), an extract from a second letter of *Honorius* to *Sergius*, in which he still farther confirms his opinion. The friends of the Romish church have taken great pains to justify this mistake of *Honorius*. The Acts of the sixth general council, say they, are corrupted, and the name of *Honorius* has been wickedly foisted into them. *Honorius* was not condemned for *heresy*, but for his *forbearance*. He meant to deny only that there were two *opposite wills* in Christ. He wrote only as a *private* person, and not as a bishop, and also when *ill-informed* by *Sergius*; and moreover retracted afterwards his opinion. But even Catholic writers have confuted these subterfuges; e. g., *Richer*, Hist. Concil. general, p. 296, &c. *Du Pin*, Biblioth., tom. vi., p. 67, &c. *Honorius* was condemned not only in the sixth general council, but also in the seventh and eighth, and in that in Trullo, and likewise by his own successors, (*Agatho*, *Leo II.*, *Hadrian*, &c.), and is named in several Rituals, and particularly in the Breviary and in the festival of *Leo II.*, as being, together with *Sergius* and *Cyrus*, a person *damnata memorie*. This is manifest proof that no one then even thought of an infallibility in the Romish popes, notwithstanding in modern times the name of *Honorius* has been erased from the Breviaries.—*Schl.* See *Bower's Lives of the Popes*, (*Agatho*), vol. iii., and *Gieseler's* Text-book, transl. by Cunningham, vol. i., p. 369, note 17.—*Tr.*]

or a twofold action or operation in Christ, he clearly stated that there was but *one will* in Christ.(11) This new law was approved by not a few in the East, and first of all by *Pyrrhus* of Constantinople, who on the death of *Sergius* succeeded to that see in the year 639.(12) But the Roman pontiff *John IV.*, in a council held this year at Rome, rejected the *Ecthesis*, and condemned the Monothelites.(13) As the controversy still continued, the emperor *Constans* in the year 648, with the consent of *Paul* of Constantinople, published a new edict, called the *Typus*; by which the *Ecthesis* was annulled, and silence enjoined on both the contending parties, as well with regard to *one will* as with regard to *one operation of will* in Christ.(14) But the impassioned monks looked upon silence as a crime; and by their instigation, *Martin* the bishop of Rome in a council of 105 bishops in the year 649, anathematized both the *Ecthesis* and the *Typus*, (but without naming the emperors), and likewise all patrons of the *Monothelites*.(15)

§ 8. The audacity of *Martin* in anathematizing the imperial edicts, provoked *Constans* to issue orders for the arrest of the pontiff by the exarch *Calliopas*, and for his transportation in the year 650 to the island of *Naxia*. *Maximus*, the ringleader of the seditious monks, he banished to *Bizyca*; and others, not less factious, were punished in different ways.(16)

(11) [This *Ecthesis* is in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 791, &c.—*Schl.*]

(12) [Previously to this, *Sergius* assembled the clergy at Constantinople, and not only established the new Concordat, but ordained that all clergymen who should not adopt it should be liable to deposition, and all monks and laymen be liable to excommunication. Extracts from the Acts of this council are given in the Acts of the Lateran council [A.D. 649], in *Harduin*, tom. iii., p. 795, &c. *Pyrrhus* the successor of *Sergius*, likewise received this formula in an assembly of the clergy A.D. 640, and commanded all bishops whether present or absent to subscribe to it. See the extracts from the Acts of this council, in *Harduin*, tom. iii., p. 797.—*Schl.*]

(13) [*Heraclius* transmitted the *Ecthesis* to pope *Severinus* at Rome, by the exarch *Isaacus*. (*Harduin*, tom. iii., p. 803.) Whether *Severinus* submitted to it, is uncertain. But that his envoys, who were sent to Constantinople to obtain the confirmation of his election, could not succeed till they had engaged he *should* receive it, is certain. His successor *John IV.* rejected it soon after his elevation to office, in a Romish council of which we have only very dubious accounts. On the side of this pope stood the island of Cyprus, and Numidia Byzicena, the Provincia Proconsularis, and Mauritania; from all of which provinces synodal epistles are still extant, showing that the bishops there passed resolutions against the *Ecthesis*. They are in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 727, &c.—*Schl.*]

(14) [This *Typus* is in *Harduin's Concilia*, tom. iii., p. 823, &c.—*Schl.*]

(15) [This council was held in the church of St. John of the Lateran, and was thence called the *Lateran Council*. The Acts of it are in *Harduin's Collection*, tom. iii., p. 626–946. The year before, pope *Theodore* had held a council at Rome, in which he condemned *Pyrrhus* who had lost the patriarchate of Constantinople in consequence of his taking part in the civil commotions of that city at the election of a new emperor, together with his successor *Paul*; and had mingled some of the sacramental wine with the ink in signing their condemnation. See *Walch's Historie der Kirchenversamml.*, p. 419. The emperor *Constans* hoped by means of his *Typus*, to put an end to all these commotions; and he would undoubtedly have succeeded, if he had had only candid and reasonable men to deal with. But at Rome a determined spirit of self-justification prevailed; and unfortunately pope *Martin* was a man who sought to gain a reputation for learning by metaphysical wrangling. He in this council condemned the opinions of an Arabian bishop, *Theodorus* of Pharan, a zealous Monophysite; but he touched so lightly on the doctrines of *Honorius*, as not even to mention his name.—*Schl.*]

(16) [To give the proceeding a less exceptionable aspect, pope *Martin* was accused of various crimes. He was charged with being a partisan of the rebel exarch *Olympius*, with sending supplies of money to the Saracens, &c. From *Naxia* he was brought

The succeeding Roman pontiffs, *Eugenius* and *Vitalianus*, were more discreet and moderate; especially the latter, who received *Constans*, upon his arrival at Rome in the year 663, with the highest honours, and adopted measures to prevent the controversy from being rekindled.(17) It therefore slept in silence for several years. But as it was only a concealed fire that burned in secret, and as new commotions hazardous to the public peace were constantly to be feared, *Constantine* Pogonatus the son of *Constans*, having advised with the Roman pontiff *Agatho*, summoned a *general council* in the year 680, which is called the *sixth* of the œcumenical councils; and here he permitted the Monothelites and the Roman pontiff *Honorius* to be condemned, in the presence of *Agatho's* legates; and he confirmed the decrees of the council with the sanction of penal laws.(18)

§ 9. It is very difficult to define the real sentiments of the Monothelites, or to tell what it was their adversaries condemned. For neither party is uniform in its statements, and both disclaim the errors objected to them. I. The Monothelites disclaimed all connexion with the *Eutychi-*

to Constantinople, and there subjected to a judicial trial. He would certainly have lost his head, as a traitor, had not the dying patriarch *Paul* moved the emperor to commute his punishment into banishment to Cherson, where he soon after died in great distress. See his 14th and following Epistles, in *Labbe*, Concilia, tom. vi., and Concilia regia, tom. xv.; also *Muratori*, History of Italy, vol. iv., p. 125, &c.—*Schl.* Also *Bower's* Lives of the Popes, vol. iii.—*Tr.*

(17) [*Vitalianus*, as soon as he was elected, despatched his envoys to Constantinople, and by them sent the customary confession of his faith to the patriarch. The discreet procedure of the pope and the political circumstances of the times, caused his envoys to be well received, and to be sent back to Rome by *Constantine* with splendid presents. The patriarch of Constantinople also, in his letter of reply, expressed warm desires for union and harmony. When the emperor *Constans* came to Rome in the year 663, in his campaign against the Lombards, the pope showed him more honour than it became his papal character to show to one who had murdered his own brother; for the emperor, a few years before, had put to death his own brother, the deacon *Theodosius*. The pope, with all his clergy, went out to meet him two miles from Rome, and escorted him into the city. But all the honours he showed to the emperor did not prevent him from carrying off to Constantinople all the brass which ornamented the city, and even the plates which covered the roof of the Pantheon. See *Anastasius*, de Vita *Vitaliani*; and *Paulus* Diaconus, Historia Longobardor., lib. v., c. 6, 7.—*Schl.*]

(18) [This council was summoned by the emperor, who presided in it in person. The

number of bishops was small at first, but increased to near 200. There were eighteen sessions, from the 7th Nov. 680 to the 16th Sept. 681. No one of the ancient councils was conducted with more decorum and fairness. Yet not the Bible, but the decrees of former councils and the writings of the fathers, were the authority relied upon. All the great patriarchs were present, either personally or by their representatives. At first the two parties were nearly balanced. But in the 8th session, March 7th, *George* the patriarch of Constantinople went over to the side of the orthodox, and was followed by all the clergy of his diocese. *Macarius* the patriarch of Antioch, who stood firm at the head of the Monothelites, was now outvoted, condemned, and deprived of his office. The Monothelites, as soon as they were adjudged to be heretics, lost their seats; and therefore the decrees of the council were finally carried by a unanimous vote. *Theodorus* of Pharan, *Cyrus* of Alexandria, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, and *Paul* of Constantinople, *Honorius* of Rome, *Macarius* of Antioch, and some others, were condemned as heretics; and the doctrine of *two wills*, a human and divine, and two *kinds of voluntary acts* in Christ, defined and established. The Acts of this council, Gr. and Lat., are in *Harduin's* Concilia, tom. iii., p. 1043–1644, and they are not falsified, as some Catholics formerly asserted. See *Combesis*, Diss. apologet. pro Actis vi. Synodi, in his Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr. Nov., tom. ii., p. 65. *Jo. Forbes*, Instructio hist. Theol., l. v., c. 10. *Du Pin*, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles., tom. vi., p. 61. *Cave*, Hist. Lit., tom. i., p. 605. *Bower*, Lives of the Popes, (*Agatho*), vol. iii.—*Tr.*]

ans and the *Monophysites*; and confessed that there were in Christ the Saviour *two natures*, so united, without mixture or confusion, as to constitute but *one person*. II. They admitted that the human soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or the faculty of willing and choosing; and that it did not lose this power of willing and choosing in consequence of its union with the divine nature. For they held and taught, that Christ was *perfect man* as well as *perfect God*; and of course, that his human soul had the power of willing and choosing. III. They denied that this power of willing and choosing in the human soul of Christ, was inactive or inoperative: on the contrary, they conceded that it operated together with the divine will. IV. They therefore, in reality admitted *two wills* in Christ, and also that both were active and operative wills.(19) Yet, V. they maintained that in a certain sense, there was but *one will* and *one operation* of will in Christ.

§ 10. But these positions were not explained in precisely the same manner, by all who were called *Monothelites*. Some of them, as may be fully proved, intended no more than that the two wills in Christ, the human and the divine, were always *harmonious*, and in this sense *one*; or that the human will always accorded with the divine will, and was therefore always holy, upright, and good. And in this opinion there is nothing censurable.(20) But others approaching nearer to the *Monophysites*, supposed that the two wills in Christ, that is, the two powers of willing, in consequence of the *personal union* (as it is called) of the two natures, were amalgamated and became *one will*; yet they still admitted that the two wills could be, and should be, discriminated in our conceptions. The greatest part of the sect and those possessing the greatest acumen, supposed that the will of Christ's human soul was the *instrument* of his divine will: yet when moved and prompted to act, it operated and put forth volitions in connexion with the divine will.(21) From this supposition, the position so obstinately maintained by the *Monothelites* was unavoidable, that in Christ there was but *one will* and *one operation of will*. For the operation of an instrument, and of him who uses it, is not twofold but one. Setting aside therefore the suspicion of *Eutychianism*, and other things connected with that question, the point in controversy was, *whether the human will of Christ sometimes acted from its own impulse, or whether it was always moved by the instigation of the divine nature*.—This controversy is a striking illustration of the fallacious and hazardous nature of every religious compromise, which is made to rest on ambiguous phraseology. The friends of the council of Chalcedon endeavoured to ensnare the *Monophysites*, by means of a propo-

^o (19) [They admitted two *faculties* or voluntary powers, a human and a divine; but maintained, that when brought into action, they operated conjunctly and as if they were but *one*. By the expression *one will* therefore, they seem to have intended *one volition* or *act* of the will, and by *one operation*, they intended *one mode of acting*. See Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ix., p. 584, &c.—Tr.]

(20) [See Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ix., p. 592, &c., where he names (in Ann. 1, p. 593) *Sergius*, *Honorius*, and the *Ecthesis*, as giving these views.—Tr.]

(21) [According to Dr. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereyen*, vol. ix., p. 594, &c., the subordination of the *human will* to the *divine* in Christ, was explained by some to be altogether *voluntary*, or a consequence of the pious resignation and the faith of the man Christ Jesus; but others supposed that it resulted from the *nature of the union*, by which the *human nature* became the *instrument* with which the *divine nature* worked; and they illustrated the subject by the subjection of man's bodily members to the empire of his mind or soul.—Tr.]

sition of dubious interpretation; and they thus imprudently involved the church and the state in long-protracted controversies.

§ 11. The doctrine of the *Monothelites* thus condemned and exploded by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the *Mardaites*, a people who inhabited the mountains of *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, and who about the conclusion of this century received the name of *Maronites*, from *Jo. Maro* their first bishop, a name which they still retain. No one of the ancients indeed has mentioned this man as being the person who brought the Libaniots to embrace Monothelism; but there are strong reasons for believing, that it was this *John* whose surname of *Maro* passed over to the people of whom he was bishop.(22) This however is demonstrable, from the testimony of *William* of Tyre and of other unexceptionable witnesses,(23) that the *Maronites* were for a long time *Monothelites* in sentiment; and that it was not till the twelfth century, or till they became reconciled with the Romish church in the year 1182, that they abandoned the error of *one will* in Christ. The most learned of the modern *Maronites* have very studiously endeavoured to wipe off this reproach from their nation, and have advanced many arguments to prove that their ancestors were always obedient to the see of Rome, and never embraced the sentiments either of the *Monophysites* or of the *Monothelites*. But they cannot persuade the learned to believe so, for these maintain that their testimonies are fictitious and of no validity.(24)

(22) The surname of *Maro* was given to this monk, because he had lived in the celebrated monastery of *St. Maro* on the river *Orontes*, before he took residence among the *Mardaites* on Mount Lebanon. A particular account is given of him, by *Jo. Sim. Asseman*, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican., tom. i., p. 496. [*Gabriel Sionita*, de Urbibus et moribus Oriental., cap. 8, derives the name of *Maronites* from an abbot *Maron*, whom he extols for his holiness and his virtues; but he will acknowledge no heretical *Maro*.—*Schl. Gieseler*, in his Text-book of Eccl. Hist., transl. by *Cunningham*, vol. i., p. 373, note 5, thinks the history of the *Maronites* has been obscured, by identifying that people with the *Mardaites*; and refers us to *Anquetil Duperron*, Recherches sur les migrations des Mardes, ancien peuple de Perse, in the Memoires de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, tome 50, p. 1, "showing that the *Mardaites*, or *Mards*, a warlike nation of Armenia, were placed as a garrison on Mount Libanus by Constantine Pogonatus A.D. 676, (*Theophanes*, p. 295), but withdrawn A.D. 685 by Justinian II., (*Theoph.*, p. 302)."—*Tr.*]

(23) [The passage of *William* of Tyre is in his *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestar.*, lib. xxxii., c. 8, and is this: "A Syrian nation in the province of Phenicia, inhabiting the cliffs of Lebanon near the city Biblos, while enjoying temporal peace, experienced a great change in its state. For having followed the errors of one

Maro a heresiarch for nearly 500 years, and so as to be called after him *Maronites*, and to be separated from the church of the faithful and maintain a separate worship; through divine influence returning now to a sound mind, they put on resolution and joined themselves to *Americus* the patriarch of Antioch."—The Alexandrian patriarch *Eutychius*, whose Annals *Pocock* has translated from the Arabic, likewise mentions a monk *Marun*, "who asserted, that Christ our Lord had *two natures* and *one will*, one operation and person, and corrupted the faith of men; and whose followers holding the same sentiments with him, were called *Maronites*, deriving their name from his name *Maro*."—*Schl.*]

(24) The cause of the *Maronites* has been pleaded by *Abrah. Eechellensis*, *Gabriel Sionita*, and others of the Maronite nation; but by none of them more fully than by *Faustus Nairon*, both in his Dissert. de origine, nomine et religione Maronitarum, Rome, 1679, 8vo, and in his Euophia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum et Chaldaeorum monumentis, Rome, 1694, 8vo. Yet *Nairon* induced none to believe his positions, except *Ant. Pagi*, (in his Critica Baroniana, ad ann. 691), and *P. de la Roque*, in whose Voyage de Syrie et de Montliban, tome ii., p. 28–128, there is a long Dissertation concerning the origin of the *Maronites*. Even *Asseman*, who being a Maronite, spared no pains to vindicate the character of his nation, (Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican., tom. i., p. 496), yet does not deny

§ 12. Neither the sixth [general] council which condemned the *Monothelites*, nor the fifth which had been held in the preceding century, enacted any canons concerning discipline and rites. Therefore a new assembly of bishops was held by order of *Justinian II.*, in the year 692 at Constantinople, in a tower of the palace which was called *Trullus*. This council, from the place of meeting, was called *Concilium Trullanum*; and from another circumstance, *Quinisextum*, because the Greeks considered its decrees as necessary to the perfection of the Acts of the fifth and sixth councils. We have one hundred and two canons sanctioned by this assembly, on various subjects pertaining to the external part of worship, the government of the church, and the conduct of Christians. But as six of these canons are opposed to the Romish opinions and customs, therefore the Roman pontiffs have refused to approve the council as a whole, or to rank it among the *general* councils, although they have deemed the greatest part of its canons to be excellent. (25)

that much of what has been written by *Nai-ron* and others, in behalf of the Maronites, is without weight or authority. See *Jo. Morin*, de Ordin. sacr., p. 380, &c. *Rich. Simon*, Histoire Critique des Chrétiens Orientaux, cap. xiii., p. 146. *Euseb. Renaudot*, Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor., p. 149, and Præfat. ad Liturgias Orientales. *Peter le Brun*, Explication de la Messe, tom. ii., p. 626, &c., Paris, 1726, 8vo. The arguments on both sides are stated, and the reader is left to form his own judgment, by *Mich. le Quien*, Christianus Oriens, tom. iii., p. 10, &c. [See also *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereyen, vol. ix., p. 474-488.—*Tr.*]

(25) See *Franc. Pagi*, Breviarium Pontiff. Roman., tom. i., p. 486. *Chr. Lupus*, Diss. de Concilio Trullano; in his Notes and Dissertations on Councils, Opp., tom. iii., p. 168, &c. The Romans reject the 5th canon, which approves of the eighty-five Apostolic Canons, commonly attributed to *Clement*:—the 13th canon, which allows priests to live in wedlock:—the 55th canon, which condemns fasting on Saturdays, a custom allowed of in the Latin church:—the 67th canon, which strictly enjoins abstinence from blood and from things strangled:—the 82d canon, which prohibits the painting of *Christ* in the image of a lamb:—and the 86th canon, concerning the equality of the

bishops of Rome and Constantinople. [The eastern patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Justiniana, with more than 200 bishops, attended this council. The Roman pontiff had no proper legate there. Yet his ordinary representatives at the imperial court sat in the council and subscribed its decisions; and *Basil* the archbishop of Crete says in his subscription, that he represented the patriarch of Rome and all the bishops under him. The emperor attended the council in person and subscribed its decrees. In the original a space was left for the subscription of the Roman pontiff; but when it was sent to Rome by the emperor, and pope *Sergius* was called on to subscribe, he showed such a refractory spirit as nearly cost him his liberty. The reason was, he found the above-mentioned canons to be contrary to the principles and usages of his church. For the same reason, the admirers of the Romish bishop to this day are not agreed whether the whole council, or only the canons which have the misfortune to displease them, should be rejected, although at an early period pope *Adrian* approved of it. On the other hand, this council was recognised by the Greeks as a valid one, and was classed among the general councils. See *Dr. Walch's* Historie der Kirchenversammlungen, p. 441.—*Schl.*]

INDEX

TO THE FIRST VOLUME.

- A.
- Abasgi*, converted in sixth century, 379.
Abbots, their origin and office, 266, 328, n. (18).
Abdas, bp. of Suza, 5th century, 319.
Abelites, sect. in 2d cent., 147, n. (22).
Abgarus, king of Edessa, 1st cent., 43, &c.
Abrazas, a term used by Basilides, 143, n. (14).
Abyssinians or *Ethiopians*, converted, 4th cent., 226.
Acacius, bp. of Cæsarea, 4th cent., 248, n., 301, n. (44).
 —, bp. of Berea, 5th cent., 334.
 —, bp. in Armenia, 5th cent., 334.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 5th cent., 324, n. (3), 335, n., 367, 368, 369.
Academics, their doctrines, 30, n. (34), 65.
Academics in Roman Empire, 2d cent., 110.
Acephali, sect. in 5th cent., 368, 410, 416.
Acolythi, an order of clergy, 165.
Acemeta, ἀκοιμήται, 5th cent., 351, n. (2).
Acta Martyrum, what, 55.
Acts of Uniformity, 5th cent., 353.
Addonites, sect. in 2d cent., 147.
Adamnanus, Irish monk, 6th cent., 436, 444.
Adrian, emp. in 2d cent., 97, 104, 106, 138.
 —, a writer in 5th cent., 340.
Ædesius, a philosopher in 4th cent., 229.
Ælia Capitolina, Jerusalem, 101.
Ælian, proconsul of Africa, 4th cent., 284.
Æneas Gazæus, 5th cent., 335, n.
Æon, Ἄων, what, among Gnostics, 63, n. (8), 91, 95, 143, 144, 145.
Ærius, a Semirian, 4th cent., 273, &c., n. (43).
Ætius, Arian, 4th cent., 248, n., 301, n. (48).
Agapetus, deacon at Constantinople, 6th cent., 395, n. (23), 408.
 —, bp. of Rome, 6th cent., 405.
Agathius, historian, 6th cent., 383, n. (3).
Agatho, bp. of Rome, 7th cent., 444, 455.
Agnoëta, sect. in 6th cent., 419, n. (20).
Agrippa Castor, writer in 2d cent., 123.
Aidon, bp. in England, 7th cent., 423, n.
Almus, converted in 6th cent., 379.
Aldhelm, Eng. bp., 7th cent., 442, n. (26), 447.
Alexander, bp. of Jerusalem, 3d cent., 175.
 — *Severus*, emp., 3d cent., 154, 156, 160.
 —, bp. of Alexandria, 4th cent., 247, n. (30), 287, &c.; his epistle, 258, n. (16).
 —, bp. of Hierapolis, 5th cent., 334.
 — of Lycopolis, a philosopher, 4th cent., 383, n. (5).
Alexandria, patriarchate of, 233, &c., n. (2).
All Saints, feast 7th cent., 449, n. (3).
Ambrose, bp. of Milan, 4th cent., 250, n. (33), 263, 264.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 4th cent., 224, n. (50).
Ammonius Saccas, a philosopher, 2d cent., 111, &c., n. (11).
 —, a Christian writer, 3d cent., 174, n., 182.
Amphilochius of Iconium, 4th cent., 245, n. (26).
Anrou, Saracen conqueror of Egypt, 451.
Anastasia, a martyr in 4th cent., 256.
Anastasius, a presbyter of Constantinople, 5th cent., 357.
 — *Sinaita*; three of this name, 396, n. (28), 407.
 —, emperor, 6th cent., 416.
 — Apocrisiarius, 7th cent., 444.
 —, Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, 451.
Anatolius, bp. of Laodicea, 3d cent., 176.
Andreas, bp. of Samosata, 5th cent., 334.
 —, bp. in Cappadocia, 5th cent., 335, n.
 —, bp. of Crete, 7th cent., 440, n. (19).
Andrew, the apostle, 48, n.
Anchorites or *Anachorites*, 267, n. (30), (31).
Anglo-Saxons, converted, 6th cent., 380, n. (6), and 7th cent., 422, &c., n. (5).
Annunciation, feast, 6th cent., 414, n. (8).
Anomæans, sect. in the 4th cent., 301.
Antidico-Marianites, sect. 4th cent., 311.
Antioch, patriarchate of, 233, &c., n. (2).
Antiochus, monk of Saba, 7th cent., 440, n. (17), 446.
Antonines, emperors, their character, 97.
Antoninus, Marcus, emp., 97, 107, 110.
 — Pius, emp., 2d cent., 97, 106.
Antony, monk, Egypt, 4th cent., 247, n., 265.
Aphonius, writer in the 7th cent., 444.
Apocrypha of the N. Test., 73, n. (23).
Apollinaris, bp. of Hierapolis, 2d cent., 124.
 — of Antioch, senior and junior, 4th cent., 247, n. (29), 263, 302, n. (52).
Apollinarian heresy, 4th cent., 302, n. (52).
Apollonius Tyaneus, 1st cent., 160, n. (16).
 —, a Gr. writer, 2d cent., 124.
Apologies of Christians, 102, 106, 107, 127.
 — of Justin Martyr, 118, n. (4).
Apostles, 43, n. (4), 45-48, 66, 72.
Apostles' Creed, 79, n. (2), 125.
Apostolic Canons and Constitutions, 75, 184, n. (13), (14).
 — Fathers, 76-79.
Appion, Gr. writer, 2d cent., 124, 174, n.
Arabians, converted, in 2d cent., 98, 99; in 3d cent., 155, 201; in 5th, 314.
Arabianus, writer of 2d cent., 124, 126.
Arator, a poet of 6th cent., 401, n. (37).
Archbishops, 117, 163, 232, 233, &c., n. (2).
Archdeacons, *Archpresbyters*, origin of, 237.
Archelaus, son of Herod, 33.

- Archelaus*, bp. of Carrha, 3d cent., 176, 193, n. *Arethas*, abp. in Cappadocia, 6th cent., 398.
- Arians*, origin of, in 4th cent., 287, &c. Sects of, 300, &c.—retire among the Goths, in 5th cent., 299, &c., 354, &c. State of, in 6th cent., 415, &c., 384, &c.; in 7th cent., 450.
- Arius*, 287, &c., 301, n. (46); his letter, 288, n. (16); his death, 297, n. (31).
- Aristides*, apologist, 2d cent., 106, 123.
- Aristotelian* philosophy, 31; in 2d cent., 110; in 3d cent., 161; in 4th, 229; in 5th, 321, 322; in 6th, 387; in 7th, 436, 450.
- Aristotle*, his opinion of God and the soul, 31.
- Armagh*, see of, erected in 5th cent., 316.
- Armenians*, converted in 4th cent., 225.
- Arnobius*, senior, 3d cent., 173, &c., n. (17). 183.
- , junior, 5th cent., 338, n. (45).
- Artemon*, heretic, 2d cent., 150, n. (27).
- Arts*, the seven Liberal, what, 321, n. (4).
- Ascension*, feast, when instituted, 449, n. (3).
- Ascetics*, 129, 265, 266, n. (28).
- Ascusage*, John, 7th cent., tritheist, 419, n. (21).
- Asterius* of Cappadocia, 4th cent., 247, n. — of Pontus, in 5th cent., 333.
- Asylum*, right of, in churches, 7th cent., 449, n. (4).
- Athanasaric*, Gothic k., 4th cent., persecutor, 228.
- Athanasius*, bp. of Alexandria, 4th cent., 239, n. (14), 262, 263, 265, n. (26), 296, &c.
- , junior, or Celestes, 5th cent., 335, n. —, bp. of Antioch, 7th cent., 452.
- Athanasian* Creed, spurious, 240, n. (14).
- Athenagoras*, apologist, 2d cent., 107, 111, 120, n. (6).
- Atticus*, bp. of Constantinople, 5th cent., 333.
- Audacious*, 4th cent., reformer, 309, n. (67).
- Audentius*, writer of 4th cent., 263.
- Audenus*, or Dado, abp. of Rouen, 7th cent., 436, 443.
- Augustine*, bp. of Hippo, 4th cent., 252, n. (35), 261, 263, 282, 286, 318, 352, 354, n. (9), 372, 373, 374, 377.
- , monk, apostle of Britain, 5th cent., 380, n. (6), 422, n. (5).
- Augustulus*, emp., 5th cent., 312.
- Augustus*, emp., 1st cent., 23, 65.
- Avitus*, bp. of Clermont, 5th cent., 341, 381, n. (11).
- Aurelian*, emp., 3d cent., 159.
- Aurelius*, bp. of Carthage, 4th cent., 258.
- Ausonius*, a poet, 4th cent., 229, n. (1).
- Autaris*, king of Lombards, 6th cent., 384.
- Ἀυτοκέφαλος*, independent bp., 233, n., 324, n. (9).
- Auxumitæ*, Ethiopians, converted, 226.
- B.
- Babacus*, Nestorian abp. of Seleucia, 5th cent., 363, n. (26).
- Baptism*, in 1st cent., 84, 87; in 2d, 134, 137, n. (17); in 3d, 189; in 4th, 281; in 6th, 413, &c.
- Baptism of heretics*, 186, 203, 286.
- Baptismal fonts*, in 4th cent., 281.
- Baradeus*, Jacobus, 6th cent., 369, 417, &c., n. (12).
- Bar-Cochebas*, Jewish impostor, 2d cent., 104, 106.
- Bardanes*, heretic, 2d cent., 124, 142.
- Barnabas*, St., 1st cent., 49, n. (9), 77.
- Barsabas*, 1st cent., 46.
- Barsanuphius*, of Gaza, 6th cent., 395.
- Barsumas*, bp. Nisibis, 5th cent., 362, &c.
- , Eutychian monk, 5th cent., 367.
- Bartholomew*, St., preached in Arabia, 48, n., 99.
- Basil the Great* of Cappadocia, 4th cent., 240, n. (15), 264.
- of Ancyra, 4th cent., 248, n., 301, n. (47).
- of Cilicia, 5th cent., 335, n.
- of Seleucia, 5th cent., 332, n. (28), 345.
- of Thessalonica, 7th cent., 441, n.
- Basilides*, 2d cent., his heresy, 143, 144.
- Believers* and Catechumens, 69.
- Bellator*, writer, in 6th cent., 407, n. (7), 409.
- Benedict*, St., of Nursia, 6th cent., 392, n. (15), 400.
- , bp. of Rome, 7th cent., 444.
- Benedictine* monks, 392, &c. Their rule, 393, n.
- Berinus*, bp. of Dorchester, Eng., 7th cent., 423, n.
- Bertha*, patroness of Augustine, 7th cent., 380.
- Beryllus* of Bostra, 3d cent., 199, &c.
- Bishops*, origin and history of, in 1st cent., 69, 71, &c.; in 2d cent., 116, &c., 136; in 3d, 163–165; in 4th, 231, 232, &c., 237; in 5th, 323, 327; in 6th, 385, 386, 390; in 7th, 435, 438, &c.
- in Great Britain, 324, n. (9), 424, n. (5).
- Bobio*, monastery, established, 6th cent., 392, n. (14).
- Bobolenus*, monk and writer, 7th cent., 444.
- Boëthius*, a Christian philosopher, 6th cent., 387, 403, n. (45), 436.
- Boniface* I., bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 339, n.
- II., —, —, 6th cent., 404.
- III., —, —, 7th cent., 436, &c.; n. (2).
- IV., —, —, 7th cent., 443.
- V., —, —, 7th cent., 443, 449.
- Bonosus*, heretic, 4th cent., 311, n. (69).
- Braulio*, bp. of Saragossa, 7th cent., 436, 443, n.
- Britons*, state of, in the two first centuries, 65, 99, n. (8); in 3d cent., 156; in 5th, 318, &c.; in 6th, 380, 384; in 7th, 422, n. (5), 437.
- Bulgaranus*, count, 7th cent., 443.
- Burgundians*, converted, 5th cent., 314.
- C.
- Cæcilian*, bp. Carthage, 4th cent., 282, &c.
- Cæsarius* of Constantinople, 4th cent., 249, n. — of Arles, 6th cent., 377, n., 400, n. (30).
- Cajanus*, *Gujanus*, or *Gaius*, bp. of Alexandria, in 6th cent., 418, n. (16).
- Cainites*, sect., in 2d cent., 147.
- Caius*, presbyter, Rome, 3d cent., 174, n. (18).
- Calumnies* against the Christians, 54, 102, 106, 107, 108, 209.
- Candidus*, Gr. writer, 2d cent., 124, 174, n.
- , Arian writer, 4th cent., 257.
- , historian, 5th cent., 335, n.
- Candlemas*, feast, 6th cent., 414, n. (7).
- Canon* of the N. Test., when settled, 72, 73.
- of the mass, what, 413, n. (1).
- Canons* of the Apostles; see *Apostolic Canons*.
- of Nice, 236, n. (7), 293, &c., n. (26).
- of Sardica, 236, n. (9).
- of Chalcedon, 323.
- Capreolus*, bp. of Carthage, 5th cent., 340.
- Caracalla*, emperor, 3d cent., 153.

- Carpocrates*, a Gnostic, 2d cent., 145.
Cassianus, John, 5th cent., 336, n. (34), 375, n. (54).
Cassiodorus Senator, 6th cent., 386, 403, n. (46), 436, 407.
Castor, Agrippa, 2d cent., 123.
Catechumens, 60, 80, 281.
Catenæ Patrum, what, 407.
Cathari, in 3d cent., 203.
Celibacy of clergy, in 3d cent., 166; in 4th, 259, 295.
Celsus, opposed Christianity, 3d cent., 108, 183.
Celts, their state in 1st cent., 65.
Cent. I., external Hist., 23; internal, 59.
 — II., ——— 97; ——— 109.
 — III., ——— 153; ——— 161.
 — IV., ——— 207; ——— 229.
 — V., ——— 312; ——— 320.
 — VI., ——— 379; ——— 385.
 — VII., ——— 421; ——— 435.
Coelfrid, English monk, 7th cent., 441.
Cerdo, heretic, 2d cent., 141.
Ceremonies and Rites, history of, in 1st cent., 83, 84-88; in 2d cent., 132-137; in 3d, 188-190; in 4th, 276-281; in 5th, 350, &c.; in 6th, 413, &c.; in 7th, 448, &c.
Cerinthus, heretic, 1st cent., 95, 96.
Chains, *Catenæ Patrum*, 407.
Chalcedon, councils of, 5th cent., 349, 366.
Chalcidius, philosopher, in 5th cent., 225, n. (51), 383, n. (4).
Chaldaic Christians, Nestorians, 363, n. (26).
Chapters, the three, what, 410, &c., n. (14).
Chilasts, Millennarians, 185, &c., n. (19).
China, enlightened by Nestorians, 7th cent., 421.
Chorepiscopi, 71, 72, 232.
Chosroes, king of Persia, 6th cent., 385, 388.
Christ, the history of, 41, &c.; revered by pagans, 43, 49; compared with philosophers, 160, 223; disputes respecting his body in 6th cent., 418, &c.
Christian Era, 41, n. (1).—Called the Dionysian era, 401, n. (34).
Christianity, its nature, 78, &c.—Causes of its rapid progress in 1st cent., 49, 50; in 2d, 101; in 3d, 154, &c.; in 4th, 217, &c., 225, 227; in 5th, 315, 317, 381, 382; in 7th, 422, 426.
 —, History of its progress in 1st cent., 45, 47, n. (9); in 2d, 98-100; in 3d, 155, 156; in 4th, 225, &c.; in 5th, 313, &c., in 6th, 379, &c.; in 7th, 421, &c.
Christians, character of, in 1st cent., 46, 82, 91; in 2d cent., 128, &c.; in 3d, 179; in 4th, 259, &c., 268; in 5th, 348, &c.; in 6th, 407, &c.; in 7th, 445, 446, &c.
Christmas, origin of, 4th cent., 279, &c., n. (12).
Chrobates or Croations converted, 7th cent., 422, n. (2).
Chromatius, bp. of Aquileia, 5th cent., 339, n.
Chronicon Alexandrinum, 441, n.
Chrysostom, John, of Constantinople, 241, n. (17), 263, 349, &c.
Church, its organization and government in 1st cent., 46, 67, 68, n. (6); in 2d, 116, &c.; in 3d, 163, 164; in 4th, 231, &c.; in 5th, 323, &c.; in 6th, 388, &c.; in 7th, 436, &c.
Churches (buildings), history of, 86, 134, 188, 277, n. (3), 351, 414 419.
Cimbrians, heard the gospel in 7th cent., 425.
Circumcelliones, sect of, 4th cent., 284, &c., 286, 353, &c.
Claudius, emperor, 3d cent., 159.
Clemens Romanus, 1st cent., 74, 75.
 — *Alexandrinus*, 2d cent., 111, 121, n. (8), 126, 128.
Clementina, spurious, 75, 76, 184, n. (16).
Clergy, character and state of, in 1st cent., 68, &c.; in 2d, 117, 118; in 3d, 165, 166; in 4th, 231, 237; in 5th, 327, &c.; in 6th, 390, n. (9), (10); in 7th, 438, n. (9).
Cloris, king of Salii, converted, 5th cent., 315.
Calestine, bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 316, 340, 358, n. (18), 376, n. (55).
Celastius, the Pelagian, 5th cent., 370, &c., n. (46).
Canobites, what, 266.
Cogitosus, an Irish monk, 6th cent., 404.
Collyridians, sect., in 4th cent., 311, n. (69).
Columbas, monk of Hii, 6th cent., 381, n. (7).
Columbanus, an Irish monk and missionary in 6th cent., 392, n. (14), 402, 424, 438, n. (7).
Commentators, the principal in 2d cent., 126; in 3d cent., 180, &c.; in 4th, 261, &c.; in 5th, 343, &c.; in 6th, 406, &c.; in 7th, 445, &c.
Commodianus, a poet, 3d cent., 175, &c.
Commodus, emperor, 2d cent., 97, 108.
Community of goods, in prim. church, 46, 70.
Concubinage of the clergy in 3d cent., 166, n. (8).
Confessions, private to priests, 5th cent., 351, n. (5).
Confessors, who, 54.
Confirmation, rite of, 87, 189.
Congal, Irish monk, 6th cent., 392, n. (13).
Conon of Tarsus, his sect, 6th cent., 420, 441, n.
Consecration of churches, 4th cent., 277.
Consociation of churches, 72; in 2d cent., 116, n. (2); in 3d, 163.
Constans I., emperor, 4th cent., 218, 298.
 — II., emperor, 7th cent., 454, 455.
Constantine I. or the Great, 210; gives liberty to Christians, 211, n. (16), 212, (19); his conversion, 213; abolishes Paganism, 213; sees a luminous cross, 213, 215, &c., n. (29); his regulations for the church, 217, n. (34), 231-234, 278, 283, &c.; his writings, 247, n; his letter to Arius and Alexander, 290, &c., n. (21).
Constantine II., emperor, 4th cent., 218, 298.
 — — IV., Pogonatus, 7th cent., 437, 455.
Constantinople, patriarchate of, 233, n., 236, &c.; the patriarchs' contest with Roman Pontiff in 4th cent., 237; in 5th cent., 323, 325, &c.; in 6th, 388, &c.; in 7th, 436, &c.
Constantinopolitan councils, general, A.D. 381, p. 306; A.D. 553, p. 409, 411; A.D. 680, p. 455; A.D. 692 or in Trullo, p. 458.
Constantius, Chlorus, 207, 209, n. (10), 210, 211.
 — I., emperor, 4th cent., 218, 298.
Constitutions of Apostles: see *Apostolic Canons*.
Controversies among Christians; in 1st cent., 83; in 2d cent., 127; in 3d, 158, 185, &c.; in 4th, 268, &c.; in 5th, 349, &c.; in 6th, 409; in 7th, 448.
Copiatæ, what their office, 165.
Cornelius, bp. of Rome, 3d cent., 175, 202, n. (19).

Corrupticolæ, sect. in 6th cent., 419.
Cosmas, Indicopleustes, 6th cent., 388, n. (16).
Councils, none in 1st. cent., 72, n. (17); originated in the 2d cent., 72, 116, 117; at first provincial, 116, n. (2).
 —, general or œcumenical, 231.
 —, the first, A.D. 325, at Nice, 291-295.
 —, the second, A.D. 381, at Constantinople, 306, &c.
 —, the third, A.D. 431, at Ephesus, 358, n. (19).
 —, the fourth, A.D. 451, at Chalcedon, 366, n. (31).
 —, the fifth, A.D. 553, at Constantinople, 411.
 —, the sixth, A.D. 680, at Constantinople, 455, n. (18).
 —, the seventh, A.D. 691, in Trullo, 448, n. (1), 458, n. (25).
Creaticolæ, a sect. in 6th cent., 419.
Creed, Apostles', 81, &c., n. (2).
 —, Nicene, 291, &c., n. (22).
Crescens, opposed Christianity, 2d cent., 109.
Cresconius, bp. in Africa, 7th cent., 442, n. (28).
Crossier, the lituus of augurs, 277, n. (2).
Cross, sign of, 190, &c., n. (20), 259, n. (1).
Cyclus Paschalis of Dionysius Exiguus, 401, n. (34).
Cummianus, Irish monk, 7th cent., 443.
Cummeneus Albus, Irish monk, 7th cent., 444.
Cypriam, bp. of Carthage, 3d cent., 158, 159, 163, n. (1), 164, n. (3), (4), 172, n. (15), 182, 183, 186, 202, n.
 —, Gallic monk, 6th cent., 405.
Cyriil, bp. of Jerusalem, 4th cent., 241, n. (16), 262.
 —, bp. of Alexandria, 5th cent., 329, n. (21), 343, 357, &c.
 —, monk of Palestine, 6th cent., 398, 408.
Cyrus, bp. of Alexandria, 7th cent., 441, n., 452.
 D.
Dado or Audænus of Rouen, 7th cent., 436, 443.
Damascius, a philosopher, 6th cent., 383, n. (6).
Damasus, I. bp. of Rome, 4th cent., 235, 255, n. (40).
Damianus and *Damianists*, 6th cent., 420.
Deaconesses, their office, 70.
Deacons, in 1st cent., 46, 68, 69, 70; in 2d cent., 116, 117; in 3d cent., 165; in 4th cent., 237; in 5th, 327.
Decius, emperor, 3d cent., persecutor, 157, &c.
Deities, the pagan, 24-27.
Demas, mentioned by Paul, 88, n. (3).
Demetrius, bp. of Alexandria, 3d cent., 187.
Demurge of oriental philos., 64, 95, 141, 146.
Demoniacs in the 4th cent., 263.
Desiderius, bp. of Vienne, 6th cent., 386, n. (4).
 —, bp. of Cahors, 7th cent., 442, n. (23).
Diadochus, bishop in Illyricum, 5th cent., 335, 346.
Didymus of Alexandria, 4th cent., 245, n. (25), 263.
Dioceses, episcopal, origin of, 71.
Diocletian, emperor, 4th cent., persecutor, 207-209.
Diodorus or *Theodorus*, bp. of Tarsus, 4th cent., 245, n. (22), 261, 263.
Dion Cassius, historian, 3d cent., 161.

Dionysius, bp. of Corinth, 2d cent., 124.
Dionysius or *Denys*, bp. of Paris, 3d cent., 156.
 — the Great, bp. of Alexandria, 3d cent., 170, n. (13), 183, 186, 199, n.
 —, bp. of Rome, 3d cent.; 175.
 — *Areopagita*, 184, n. (17), 264, n. (22).
 — *Exiguus*, 6th cent., 401, n. (34), 408.
Dioscorus, bp. of Alexandria, 5th cent., 365, 366.
Diotrephes, 1st cent., 88, n. (3).
Disciples, the 70, of Christ, 43, n. (5), 66, 67.
Divinity: see *Theology*.
Docetæ, Gnostic sect, described, 141, § 7.
 —, sect in 6th cent., 418.
Doctrine, secret, of early Christians, 81, 82.
 —, two-fold, or two-fold rule of life, 128, &c., 264, &c., 408.
Domitian, emperor, 1st cent., persecutor, 53, 58, &c.
Domitilla, Flavia, 1st cent., martyr, 59.
Donatists, sect of, its history, in 4th cent., 282-286; in 5th, 352-354; in 6th, 415.
Donatus, a Donatist bp., 4th cent., 256, 283, n. (3), 285.
Dorotheus, pseudo, 4th cent., 247, n. (30).
 —, bp. of Martianople, 5th cent., 334, 357, n. (18).
 —, abbot, 7th cent., 440, n. (16), 446.
Dositheus, heretic, 1st cent., 92, n. (7).
Dracontius, poet, 5th cent., 339, n. (46).
Druids, 65, 327, n. (14).
Ducenarius, what, 200, n. (14).
Dynamius, a writer of 6th cent., 406, n.

E.

Eadbald, king of Kent, 7th cent., 423, n.
East Anglia converted, 7th cent., 423, n.
East Saxons converted, 7th cent., 423, n.
Easter, disputes about it, in 2d cent., 135, &c.; 4th cent., 294; 7th cent., 423, n., 448.
Ebionites, sect, 2d cent., 96, 139.
Eclectic philosophy, 32, 110, &c., 224.
Ecthesis of Heraclius, 7th cent., 453, &c.
Economical method of disputing, 155, n. (5), 183, n. (11).
Edwin, king of Northumberland, 7th cent., 423, n.
Elcesaites, sect., 2d cent., 140.
Eligius or *Eloi*, bp., 7th cent., 435, 442, n. (24), 445, n. (2).
Elpidius, Rusticus, of 5th cent., 341.
Elxai, heretic, 2d cent., 140.
Empire, Roman, state of, at Christ's birth, 23, &c.; favourable to the propagation of Christianity, 24; its civil and ecclesiastical divisions and provinces in 4th cent., 232, n. (2).
Encratites, sect, 2d cent., 143; 4th cent., 282.
England, when first converted, 99, &c., n. (8).
Ennodius, bp. of Pavia, 6th cent., 389, 391, 400, n. (32), 408.
Ephesine general council, A.D. 431, p. 358, n. (19).
 — council of robbers, A.D. 449, p. 365.
Ephraim, Syrus, 4th cent., 244, n. (20), 263.
 —, patriarch of Antioch, 6th cent., 398.
Epictetus, Stoic philosopher, 2d cent., 110.
Epicureans, 30, n. (33), 65, 110.
Epiphanius, bp. in Cyprus, 4th cent., 242, n. (18), 262, 263, 275, 349.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 6th cent., 397.

- Epiphanius* Scholasticus, eccl. hist., 6th cent., 404, n.
Epiphany, day of, fixed, in 4th cent., 279.
Episcopacy: see *Bishops*.
Eremites or *Hermits*, in 3d cent., 179; in 4th, 266, &c., 328, n. (18); in 5th, 346.
Essenes, Jewish sect, 36, 37.
Ethelbert, king of Kent, 6th cent., 379, &c.
Ethiopians converted, 4th cent., 226.
Evagrius, archdeacon of Constantinople, 4th cent., 249, n.
 —, a Gallic presbyter, 6th cent., 345, n. (13).
 — Scholasticus, eccl. historian, 6th cent., 396, n. (27).
Evangelists, who so called, 66, 67.
Eucherius, bp. of Lyons, 5th cent., 333, 336, n. (36), 346.
Euchites or *Messalians*, 4th cent., 310, &c.
Eudocia, empress and writer, 5th cent., 333.
Eudoxia, empress, opposed Chrysostom, 349.
Eudoxius, bp. of Constantinople, 4th cent., 248, n.
Eugenius, abp. of Toledo, 7th cent., 443.
Eugyppius, monk of Italy, 6th cent., 404, 408.
 —, monk of Africa, 6th cent., 405.
Eulogius, presbyter of Antioch, 6th cent., 395, &c., n. (24).
Eunapius, pagan philosopher, 4th cent., 224.
Eunomius and *Eunomians*, 4th cent., 248, 301, &c., n. (50).
Evodius, bp. in Africa, 5th cent., 339, n.
Eusebians, a party in 4th cent., 300.
Eusebius Pamphili, bp. of Caesarea, 4th cent., 237, &c., n. (12), 263, 275; 300, n. (43).
 —, bp. of Nicomedia, Arian, 4th cent., 247, n., 290, 296, 300, n. (43).
 —, bp. of Emessa, 4th cent., 248, n., 263.
 — of Vercelli, 4th cent., 257, 271, &c., n. (40).
 — of Doryleum, 5th cent., 335, n., 365.
 — of Thessalonica, 7th cent., 441, n.
Eustathians, sect in 4th cent., 270, &c., n. (39).
Eustathius of Antioch, 4th cent., 245, n. (24).
 — of Armenia, 4th cent., 270, &c., n. (39).
 — of Sebaste, 4th cent., 271, n. (43).
 — of Syria, 5th cent., 335, n.
 —, Latin writer, 5th cent., 340.
Eustratus of Constantinople, 6th cent., 398.
Euthalius, deacon in Egypt, 5th cent., 335, n.
Eutharius, abp. of Tyanea, 5th cent., 334.
Eutropius, bp. of Valencia, 6th cent., 406, n.
Eutyches, heretic, 5th cent., 335, n., 364, &c.
Eutychians, sect, 5th cent., 364, &c.
Eutychius, bp. of Constantinople, 6th cent., 398.
Euzoius, Arian, bp. of Antioch, 4th cent., 272, n.
Ewald, two English missionaries, 7th cent., 425, n. (10).
Exarchs, ecclesiastical, 232.
Excommunication, in 1st and 2d cent., 82, 131; in 3d, 158, 203; in 4th, 291; in 5th, 327, n. (14).
Exorcism before baptism, 3d cent., 189, &c., n. (13).
Exorcists, in 3d cent., 165, 189, &c., n. (13).
Exposition of Scriptures: see *Theology*, exegetic.
Exucutians, Arians, 4th cent., 301, &c., n. (49).
- F.
- Facundus*, African bp., 6th cent., 401, n. (36).
Fastidius, Priscus, Briton, 5th cent., 339, n., 346.
Fasting, in 1st cent., 87, &c.; in 2d, 151; in 3d, 190; in 4th, 280; in 5th, 351.
Fathers, Apostolic, 76-78.
Faustinus, a Luciferian, 4th cent., 258.
Faustus, a Manichæan, 4th cent., 258.
 —, bp. of Riez, 5th cent., 341, 376, n. (55).
 —, disciple of St. Benedict, 443.
Felicitas, a martyr, 3d cent., 156, 157.
Felix, bp. of Aptunga, 4th cent., 283, &c.
 — I., bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 341.
 — III., bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 367, 369.
 — IV., bp. of Rome, 6th cent., 404.
 —, bp. of Dunwich, England, 7th cent., 423, n.
Festivals, in 1st cent., 85; in 2d, 135, 136; in 4th, 278, &c., n. (12); in 6th, 414; in 7th, 449.
Firmilian of Cappadocia, 3d cent., 175.
Flavia Domitilla, a martyr, 1st cent., 59.
Flavianus, bp. of Antioch, 4th cent., 249, n.
 —, bp. of Constantinople, 5th cent., 335, n., 365.
Flavius Clemens, a martyr, 1st cent., 59.
Florinians, sect, 2d cent., 148.
Florus, Paul Cyrus, a poet, 6th cent., 398.
Fortunatianus, bp. of Aquileia, 4th cent., 256.
Fortunatus, bp. of Poitiers, 6th cent., 402, n. (40).
Fosteland, island of, 425, n. (10).
Franks in Gaul, converted, 5th cent., 315.
Franconians converted, 7th cent., 425, n. (9).
Frauds, pious, in 1st cent., 73, 74; in 2d, 130, &c., 155; in 3d, 184; in 4th, 260, 267, &c.; in 5th, 346.
Fredegarius, a French historian, 7th cent., 442, &c., n. (29).
Frieslanders converted, 7th cent., 425.
Fronto assails Christians, 2d cent., 108, n. (20).
Fructuosus, abp. of Braga, 7th cent., 439, 444.
Fruventius converts the Abyssinians, 4th cent., 225, &c.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, Africa, 6th cent., 400, n. (31), 408.
 — Ferrandus, 6th cent., 401, n. (35).
Fullo, Peter, 5th cent., 367, &c.
- G.
- Gajanus*, or *Gainus*, or *Cajanus*, bp. of Antioch, in 6th cent., 418, n. (16).
Gall, St., 7th cent., his life, 424, n. (8).
Galerius Maximin, 3d cent., persecutes, 208, &c.
Gallienus, emperor, 3d cent., 154, 159.
Gallus, emperor, 3d cent., persecutes, 158.
Gamahel, Jewish patriarch, 5th cent., 319.
Gaudentius of Brescia, 4th cent., 258.
Gauls, state of, in 1st cent., 65; converted, in 2d cent., 99, 100, n. (9); in 3d, 156; in 4th, 227.
Gelasius I., bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 341, 346.
 — of Cyzicum, 5th cent., 332, n. (30).
Gennadius of Marseilles, 5th cent., 341, 345.
Genetric, Vandal king in Africa, Arian, persecutes, 355.
George, bp. of Laodicea, 4th cent., 248, n.
 —, monk of Galatia, 7th cent., 441, n.
 —, bp. of Alexandria, 7th cent., 441, n.
Georgians converted in 4th cent., 226.
Germanus, (St. Germain,) of Paris, 6th cent., 405.
Germany, state of, in 1st cent., 65; in 2d, 99;

in 3d, 156; in 5th, 314; in 6th, 381; in 7th, 423, &c.

Gifts, extraordinary: see *Miracles*.

Gildas the Wise, Briton of 6th cent., 402, n. (42).

Gnostics, in 1st cent., 73, 89, &c.; in 2d, 140-148; in 3d, 191; in 4th, 307, &c.

Gylois, what, 29, 61, &c., 88, &c.

Godfathers or sponsors, 2d cent., 137.

Gordianus, Bened. monk, 6th cent., 405.

Goths, conversion of, 155, 226, 299, &c., n. (39)-(41).

Grace, contests about, in 5th cent., 370, &c., 375, &c., 377; in 6th cent., 415; in 7th, 450.

Gratianus, proconsul, Asia, 2d cent., 106.

Gratian, 3d cent., preached in Gaul, 156.

—, emperor, 4th cent., 285, &c., 299 n. (37).

Greeks and Latins at variance, 7th cent., 436, &c.

Gregentius, abp. in Arabia, 6th cent., 345, 398.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, 3d cent., 169, n. (12), 182.

— Illuminator, Armenia, 4th cent., 225.

— Nazianzen, 4th cent., 242, &c., n. (19), 261, 263.

— Nyssen, 4th cent., 243, n. (19).

— the Great, bp. of Rome, 6th cent., 380, n. (6), 386, n. (4), 389, n. (1), 394, 395, n. (18), 399, n. (29), 406, 407, 412.

—, bp. of Tours, 6th cent., 402, n. (14).

— or George, Pisides, 7th cent., 420, n. (20).

H.

Hadrian: see *Adrian*.

Heathen: see *Pagan*.

Hegesippus, eccles. hist., 2d cent., 123.

Helena, mother of Constantine, 4th cent., 259, n. (1).

Heliogabalus, emperor, 3d cent., 186.

Helladius, bp. of Tarsus, 5th cent., 334.

Helvetians converted in 7th cent., 424, n. (8).

Hemerobaptists, Jewish sect, 34, &c., n. (7).

Henoticon, an edict of Zeno, 5th cent., 368, n. (36).

Heraclian of Chalcedon, 6th cent., 415.

Heraclides, monk of Constantinople, 5th cent., 333.

Heraclitus, Greek writer, 2d cent., 124, 174, n.

Heraclius, emperor, 7th cent., 451, 452, 453.

Heresies, what, xvii.; in 1st cent., 88-96; in 2d, 138-152; in 3d, 191-203; in 4th, 282, &c.; in 5th, 352, &c.; in 6th, 415, &c.; in 7th, 450, &c.

Hermas, Shepherd of, 77, 78.

Hermes, ancient pagan philosopher, 112, 131, n. (15).

Hermits or *Eremites*, in 3d cent., 179; in 4th, 266, &c.

Hermogenes of 2d cent., 150, n. (28).

Hero, Platon. philos., 5th cent., 322, n. (12).

Herod the Great, 33, 39.

Heruli invade Italy, 5th cent., 312.

— converted, 6th cent., 379.

Hesychius of Egypt, 3d cent., 176, 179.

Hesychius, bp. of Jerusalem, 7th cent., 439, n. (15), 446, 447.

Hesapla of Origen, 179, n. (6).

Hierarchy, its origin, 116-118. See more under *Church*, government of.

Hierax and *Hieracites*, 3d cent., 197.

Hierocles, philosopher, 4th cent., 223, n. (45).

Hieronymus: see *Jerome*.

Hilarion, Syrian monk, 4th cent., 265.

Hilary, bp. of Poitiers, 4th cent., 248, &c., n. (31).

—, bp. of Arles, 5th cent., 340, 376, n. (55).

Hilary of Rome, Luciferian, 4th cent., 257.

—, bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 341.

Hindoo Literature, 60, n. (5).

Hippolytus of 3d cent., 168, &c., n. (11), 182, 183.

History, ecclesiastical, what, xv.; external and internal, xvi., xvii.; how to be treated, xvii., &c.; dangers to be avoided, xviii.; its uses, xix.

Honorius, emperor, 4th cent., 222, 312, 353.

— 1, bp. of Rome, 7th cent., 443, 449; he was not infallible, 453, n. (10), 455.

Hormisdas, bp. of Rome, 6th cent., 404, 412.

Hosius of Corduba, 4th cent., 245, n. (23), 213, n. (23), 284.

Humeric, Arian king of Vandals in Africa, 5th cent., persecutes, 355.

Huns, in 6th cent., 384.

Hyle, ἔλν, of the Manichæans, 194.

Hypatia, fem. philos., 4th cent., 230, n. (5).

I & J.

Jacobites or *Monophysites*, 417, 418.

Jacobus, Baradaeus, restorer of the Monophysites, in 6th cent., 417, &c., n. (12).

Jamblichus, Platonic philosopher, 4th cent., 229, n. (2).

James, son of Zebedee, martyr, 48, n. (9).

— the Just, or the less, martyr, 48, n. (9).

—, bp. of Nisibis, 4th cent., 247, n., 263.

—, bp. of Edessa, 7th cent., 426.

Ibas, bp. of Edessa, 5th cent., 334, 363, n. (26), 410, n. (14).

Iberians, converted, 4th cent., 226.

Idacius, Clarus, a Span. bp., 4th cent., 258.

Idatius or *Hydatius*, Span. bp., 5th cent., 340.

Jerome or *Hieronymus*, monk, 4th cent., 249, n. —, monk, presbyter, and learned father, 251, n. (34), 261, 275, 349.

Jerusalem, first church there, 46; demolished by the Romans, A.D. 70, p. 52; rebuilt, and called *Ælia Capitolina*, in 2d cent., 104; captured by the Saracens, 7th cent., 440, n. (18); patriarchate of, 233, n. (2).

Jesujabas, a Nestor. patr., 7th cent., 421, 450.

Jews, civil and religious state, at Christ's birth, 33-40; notices of, in 1st cent., 51, 52, 64; in 2d cent., 104, 106, 138; in 3d, 160; in 4th, 221; in 5th, 314, n. (7), 319; in 6th, 381; in 7th, 426.

Ignatius, bp. of Antioch, 2d cent., 76, n. (31), 106.

Idelfonsus of Toledo, 7th cent., 441, n. (22), 446, n. (5).

Image-worship, in 4th cent., 260, 270; in 5th, 343, 351; in 6th, 406; in 7th, 445.

Incense, in worship, 3d cent., 188, n. (4).

Independence of primitive churches, 72, 116.

Indians (Arabs), converted by Pantænus, 98.

Innocent I., bp. of Rome, 5th cent., 339, n.

Interpreters of Scripture: see *Commentaries*.

John the apostle, martyr under Domitian, 48, n. (9), 59.

— the Baptist, 42; his festival instituted, 414, n. (9).

—, bp. of Jerusalem, 4th cent., 249, n., 275, 373.

- John Chrysostom*: see *Chrysostom*.
 —, bishop of Antioch, 5th cent., 333, 358, &c., n. (18), (19), 362.
 — *Egeates*, 5th cent., 335, n.
 — the Faster, bishop of Constantinople, 6th cent., 389, n. (1), 396, n. (25).
 —, bishop of Constantinople, 6th cent., 397.
 — *Climacus*, Sinaita, 6th cent., 398.
 — *Maro*, 6th cent., 399, n. (28).
 — Philoponus, 6th cent., 384, 387, 408, 419, n. (22).
 — Scholasticus, bishop of Constantinople, 6th cent., 398.
 — of Scythopolis, 6th cent., 408.
 — H., bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 404, 412.
 —, monk of Spain, 6th cent., 405.
 — Ascusnaga, 6th cent., 419, n. (21).
 — Malala, historian, 7th cent., 441, n.
 — Moschus, monk of Palestine, 7th cent., 436, 441, n.
 —, archbishop of Dara, 7th cent., 441, n.
 —, archbishop of Thessalonica, 7th cent., 441, n.
 — IV., bishop of Rome, 7th cent., 443, 454.
Iona, *Hii*, or *I-calm-kill*, 6th cent., 381, n. (7).
Jonas, an Irish monk, 7th cent., 436, 443.
 —, disciple of Columbanus, 7th cent., 444.
Jornandes or *Jordanes*, historian, 6th cent., 405.
Jovian, emperor, 4th cent., 222, n. (43), 299.
Jovinian, Italian monk and reformer, 4th cent., 274, n. (44).
Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, 2d cent., 100, 118, &c., n. (5), 136.
 —, count, and bishop of Tyre, 5th cent., 334.
Irish nation, converted in 5th cent., 316.
Isaac, a converted Jew, 5th cent., 334.
 —, bishop of Nive, 6th cent., 398.
Isidorus of Pelusium, 5th cent., 330, n. (23), 344.
 — of Corduba, 5th cent., 339, n., 343.
 — of Seville, 6th cent., 403, n. (44), 407, 408.
 — of Gaza, a philosopher, 230, 387, n. (8).
Isychius or *Hesychius*, bishop of Jerusalem, 7th cent., 439, n. (15), 446, 447.
Judas, a writer of 3d cent., 174, n.
Julia Mammæa, 3d cent., 154, n. (3).
Julian, emperor, 4th cent., 218, 219, &c., n. (40), 224, 285, 298.
 —, a Pelagian bishop and writer, 5th cent., 339, n.
 —, bishop of Halicarnassus, 6th cent., 397, 407, 418.
 —, archbp. of Toledo, 7th cent., 438, n. (6).
 — Pomerius, 5th cent., 341, 347.
 — — — —, 7th cent., 442, n. (27), 446, 448.
Julius Africanus, 3d cent., 167, 168, n. (10).
 — I., bishop of Rome, 4th cent., 256.
 — Firmicus Maternus, poet, 4th cent., 256, 263.
Junilius, bishop in Africa, 6th cent., 405, 406.
Justification, contest on, 1st cent., 83.
Justin Martyr, 2d cent., 107, 118, n. (4), 126, 127, 128; his *Apologies*, 118, &c., n. (4).
 —, bishop in Sicily, 5th cent., 335, n.
Justinian I., emperor, 6th cent., 384, 387, 404, 409, 410, 411.
Justus, a Spanish bishop, 6th cent., 404.
 —, bp. of Rochester, 7th cent., 422, n. (5).
Juvenal, bishop of Elia (Jerusalem), 5th cent., 324.
Juvenius, Spanish poet, 4th cent., 255, n. (41).
- VOL. I.—N N N
- K.
- Kabbala*, Jewish, 39, 64.
Kalifs, Mohammed's successors, 431, n. (8*); extend their empire, *ibid*.
Kent, kingdom of, converted, 7th cent., 380, 422, &c., n. (5).
Kilian, Irish missionary, 7th cent., 424, &c., n.
Kneeling in prayer, 3d cent., 190.
Koran, its origin and preservation, 427, n. (4).
- L.
- Labarum*, sacred standard of Constantine, 216, n. (30).
Lactantius, writer of 4th cent., 249, &c., n. (32), 262, 263.
Lapsed Christians, 157, 158, n. (8), 201, &c., n. (19), 294.
Laura, of monks, what, 409, n. (13).
Laurentius, a martyr, 3d cent., 159.
 —, bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 391.
 —, bishop of Novara, 6th cent., 404.
 —, bishop of Canterbury, 7th cent., 422, n. (5).
Leander, archbishop of Seville, 6th cent., 406, note.
Learning, state of, in 1st cent., 59-65; in 2d, 109-116; in 3d, 161-162; in 4th, 229-231; in 5th, 320, &c.; in 6th, 385, &c.; in 7th, 435, &c.
Lectors or readers, 165.
Legion, thundering, in 2d cent., 103, 104.
Lent, in 4th cent., 280, n. (13).
Leo I., the Great, bishop of Rome, 5th cent., 323, 326, 335, n. (32), 351, 365, &c.
 — H., bishop of Rome, 7th cent., 444.
Leonidas, father of Origen, 3d cent., 156.
Leontius, Arian bishop of Antioch, 4th cent., 248, n.
 — of Byzantium, 6th cent., 396, n. (26), 408.
 — of Neapolis, Cyprus, 6th cent., 399, n. (28), 407, 408.
Libaniots, converted, 5th cent., 313.
Libanius, sophist, 4th cent., 223, 224, n. (48).
Libellatici, what, 157, n. (6).
Liberators of Carthage, 6th cent., 401, &c., n. (39).
Libertus, bishop of Rome, 4th cent., 257, 298.
Licinianus, bishop in Spain, 6th cent., 405.
Licinius, emperor, 4th cent., 217.
Litanies to the saints, 6th cent., 414, n. (3).
Liturgies, 86, 190, n. (19), 278, 413, n. (1).
Lombards, occupy Italy A.D. 568, and become Christians A.D. 587, p. 384, 450.
Lord's prayer, use of, 190, n. (19).
Lord's supper, in 1st cent., 46, 84, 86; in 2d, 137; in 3d, 188, &c.; in 4th, 281; in 6th, 413.
Love-feasts, *ἀγάπαι*, 46, 68, &c., 87, 137, 351, n. (4).
Lucian of Antioch, 3d cent., 176, 179, 182.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 4th cent., 257, 271, &c., n. (40).
Luciferians, sect, 4th cent., 257, 271, &c.
Lucius, king of England, 2d cent., 99, n. (8).
Lupus, bishop of Troyes, 5th cent., 340.
Lyons and *Vienne*, persecution in 2d cent., 108.
- M.
- Macarius*, senior and junior, monks of Egypt, 4th cent., 216, n. (28), 264.

- , Monothelite patriarch, 7th cent., 441, n., 455, n. (18).
- Macedonius*, and *Macedonians*, 4th cent., 305, &c., n. (62), (63).
- MacLaine*, his translation of Mosheim, p. v., &c.
- Macrobius*, Donatist bishop, 4th cent., 257.
- Magians* of Persia, 59, &c.
- Magus*: see *Simon Magus*.
- Mahomet*: see *Mohammed*.
- Majorinus*, Donatist bishop of Carthage, 4th cent., 283.
- Malchion*, a rhetorician, 3d cent., 175, 201.
- Malchus*, a Byzantine historian, 5th cent., 335, note.
- Mamertus*, Claudius, poet, 5th cent., 341, 351, n. (1).
- Manes* or *Manicheus*, heretic, 3d cent., 192, &c., n. (6).
- Manicheans*, sect of, in 3d cent., 192–196; in 4th, 282, 352; in 6th, 415; in 7th, 450.
- Maphrian*, or primate of the Monophysites, 418.
- Marcella*, a martyr, 3d cent., 157.
- Marcellinus*, Ammianus, historian, 4th cent., 224, n. (50).
- , governor of Africa, 5th cent., 353.
- , count, a writer, 6th cent., 405.
- , English missionary, 7th cent., 425, n. (10).
- Marcellus* of Ancyra, 4th cent., 247, n., 303, &c., n. (55), (56).
- Marcion* and *Marcionites*, 2d cent., 141, &c., 352.
- Marculfus*, Gallic monk, 7th cent., 442, n. (25).
- Marcus*, a Gnostic, 2d cent., 147.
- , bishop in Egypt, 4th cent., 248, n.
- , a Gnostic in Spain, 4th cent., 307.
- , a hermit, 5th cent., 333, 346.
- , a disciple of St. Benedict, 7th cent., 443.
- Mardaites*, 457. See *Maronites*.
- Marius Mercator*, 5th cent., 338, n. (41).
- , bishop in Switzerland, 6th cent., 405.
- Maro*, John, 7th cent., 457, n. (22), (23).
- Maronites*, 457, n. (22), (23), (24).
- Martin*, bishop of Tours, 4th cent., 227, n. (64), 265, &c., 308, n. (65).
- , bishop of Braga, 6th cent., 405, 408.
- I., bishop of Rome, 7th cent., 444, 454, n. (15), (16).
- Martyrs*, 47, n. (8); their number and estimation, 51, 55, 125, &c., 158, 280.
- Mary*, St., worshipped, 4th cent., 311; her images, in churches, 5th cent., 351; called the Mother of God, 5th cent., 357.
- Masses* for the dead, 4th cent., 281.
- Massilians*, 375, &c. See *Semipelagians*.
- Matthew*, the apostle, 48, n.
- Matthias*, the apostle, 46.
- Maurus*, St., a Benedictine monk, 6th cent., 394.
- , archbishop of Ravenna, 7th cent., 438, n. (7).
- Maxentius*, John, 6th cent., 395, n. (22).
- Maximian*, emperor, 3d cent., persecutes, 208, &c.
- Macimilla*, a Montanist, 2d cent., 152.
- Marimin*, emperor, 3d cent., persecutes, 157, 212.
- Maximin*, bishop in Cilicia, 5th cent., 334.
- Maximus*, Greek writer, 2d cent., 124, 174, n.
- Maximus*, a pagan philosopher, 4th cent., 229, &c., n. (4).
- Maximus* of Turin, 5th cent., 336, n. (35).
- of Riez, 5th cent., 340.
- of Constantinople, 7th cent., 439, n. (14), 446, 447.
- Melchisedes*, bishop of Rome, 4th cent., 283.
- Melchisedeckians*, sect, 2d cent., 150, n. (27).
- Melchites*, who so called, 417, n. (12), 451.
- Meletian* contest in Egypt, 4th cent., 268, &c., n. (37), 294, &c., n. (27).
- Meletian* controversy at Antioch, 4th cent., 272, n.
- Meletius*, bishop of Sebaste, 4th cent., 248, n., 272, n.
- of Mopsuestia, 5th cent., 334.
- Melito*, bishop of Sardis, 2d cent., 123, 126.
- Mellitus*, first bishop of London, 7th cent., 422, n. (5).
- Menander*, heretic, 1st cent., 94.
- Mennas*, bishop of Constantinople, 6th cent., 409.
- Mercator*, Marius, 5th cent., 338, n. (41).
- Mercia*, kingm. of, converted, 7th cent., 423, n.
- Messalians* or *Euchites*, 4th cent., 310, &c.
- Methodius*, 3d cent., 170, 171, n. (14), 182, 183.
- Metropolitans*, origin of, 71, 117, 163, 232.
- Millennial* controversy, 3d cent., 185, n. (19).
- Miltiades*, 2d cent., 124.
- Ministry*, public, necessary, 66.
- Minucius*, Felix, 3d cent., 173, n. (16), 183.
- Miracles*, in 1st cent., 45, n. (2), 50; in 2d, 101, 102, &c., n. (14); in 3d, 155; in 4th, 215, &c., 221, &c., 227; in 5th, 315, n. (11), 317, 355; in 6th, 382; in 7th, 445.
- Mithras* of the Persians, 194.
- Modestus*, Greek writer, 2d cent., 124.
- Mohammed*, his early life and education, 426, n. (2); writers who treat of him, 427, n. (3); professes to be a prophet and reformer, 428; his first converts, 428, &c.; meets opposition, 429; his flight, 429; employs force, and subdues Arabia, 429; his death and character, 430; his testament, 450, &c., n. (3).
- Mohammedan* religion, its character, 430; causes of its progress, 430, &c.; its propagation, 431, n. (8*).
- Mohammedan* sects, the *Sonnites* and *Shiites*, 432; the subordinate sects, 432, &c., n. (11).
- Mohammedan* prophets, 434, n.
- Monarchians*, sect of, 2d cent., 149.
- Monkery*, in 1st cent., 38, n. (14); in 2d, 115, 129, &c.; in 3d, 179; in 4th, 265, &c.; in 5th, 328, &c., 346, &c.; in 6th, 385, 391, &c.; in 7th, 438, 439.
- Monophysites*, in 5th cent., 367, 368, &c., n. (38), (43); in 6th, 387, 410, 416, &c.; in 7th, 450, &c.
- Monothelites*, rise of, in 7th cent., 452; their tenets, 455, &c.; and history, 456–458.
- Montanus*, a schismatic, 2d cent., 151, 152.
- , archbishop of Toledo, 6th cent., 404.
- Moralists* and *morals*: see *Theology*, practical.
- Morality* of the fathers, 128, n. (6).
- Moschus*, John, a monk, 7th cent., 436, 441, n.
- Moses*, a Jewish fanatic of Crete, 4th cent., 314, n. (7).
- Mosheim*, his life and character, p. iii., &c.
- Musanus*, a writer of 2d cent., 124.
- Mutianus* Scholasticus, 6th cent., 405.
- Mysteries*, the pagan, 26; copied by Christians, 133.
- Mystics*, in 2d cent., 115; in 3d, 178, &c., 184;

in 4th, 262, 264, &c.; in 5th, 346; in 6th, 408; in 7th, 447.

N.

- Narcissus*, bishop of Jerusalem, 3d cent., 174, n.
Nations, state of, at Christ's birth, 23-33.
Nazareans, sect in 2d cent., 96, 139.
Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, 4th cent., 249, n.
Nemesius, bishop of Emessa, 4th cent., 249, n.
Nennius, a British monk, 7th cent., 443.
Nepos, bishop in Egypt, 3d cent., 185, 186.
Nero, emperor, 1st cent., persecutes, 49, n. (11), 53, 55-58.
Nestorianus, a chronographer, 5th cent., 335, n.
Nestorius, heresiarch, 5th cent., 333, &c., 356, &c.
Nestorianism, what, 360, &c., n. (21); history of, in 5th cent., 356, &c.; in 6th, 387, 416; in 7th, 450, &c.
Nicaea of Romacia, 5th cent., 344.
Nice, council of, A.D. 325, p. 291-295, notes.
Nicetus, archbishop of Treves, 6th cent., 404, 408.
Nicias, a writer of 7th cent., 448.
Nicolaitans, sect, in 1st cent., 94, n. (16).
Nilus of Constantinople, a writer, 5th cent., 331, n. (27), 346.
Ninian, English bishop in 5th cent., 381, n. (7).
Noëtus, and Noëtians, 3d cent., 197, n. (11).
Nonnosus, writer of 6th cent., 398.
Nonnus, Egyptian poet, 5th cent., 333.
 —, monk of Palestine, 6th cent., 409, n. (13).
Northumberland, converted in 7th cent., 423, n.
Novatian or *Novatus*, 3d cent., 175, 201; his sect, 201-203, 294, 352.
Novatus of Carthage, 3d cent., 202, &c., n. (19).

O.

- Oblations*, in 1st cent., 68, 71, 86; in 2d cent., 135.
Odoacer, king of the Heruli, conquered Italy, A.D. 476, p. 312.
Œconomical method of disputing, 155, n. (5), 183, n. (11).
Œcumenical, or general *Councils*: see *Councils*.
Œcumenical or universal bishop, 389, n. (1), 437.
Olympiodorus, a Platonic philosopher, 4th cent., 230.
 —, a historian, 5th cent., 319, n. (7), 322.
 —, a commentator, 6th cent., 397, 407.
Omar, kalif, captured Jerusalem, 7th cent., 440, n. (18), 450.
Ὁμοιωσις, of like essence, 301, n. (47).
Ὁμοιότης, of the same essence, 291, 296, n. (29).
Ophtes, sect of, 2d cent., 148, n. (25).
Optatus of Milevi, 4th cent., 253, n. (36).
Oracles, the pagan, 28, n. (28).
Oresiusis, monk of Egypt, 4th cent., 248, n.
Orentius, *Orontius*, *Oresius*, bishop of Aux, 5th cent., 345, n. (13).
 —, bishop of Eliberis, 6th cent., 401, n.
Origen of Alexandria, 3d cent., 155, 162, 206, n. (9), 177-183, n. (2)-(8), 187, 188, 200, 201, 261, 275, 287.
Origenists, 275, 349, 409, n. (13).
Orosius, Paul, historian, 5th cent., 318, 336, n. (33), 373.
Ostiarii, their office, 3d cent., 165.
Ostrogoths, A.D. 492 invade Italy, 312.

Oswald, king of Northumberland, 7th cent., 423, n.
Osui, king of Northumberland, 7th cent., 423, note.

P.

- Pachonius*, Egyptian monk, 4th cent., 248, n., 328, n. (18).
Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona, 4th cent., 257, 262.
Paganism, its character, 24, &c.; remains of, it in 4th cent., 217, &c., 223, 227; in 5th cent., 313, 318; in 6th, 349, 382, &c.; in 7th, 426.
Palestine, provinces of, 233, n., 324.
Palladius, monk, 4th cent., 246, n. (27), 331, n. (25).
 —, missionary to Ireland, 5th cent., 316.
Pamphilus, the martyr, 3d cent., 176, 179, 244, n. (21).
Pantenus of Egypt, 2d cent., 98, n. (5), 111, 124, 126.
Pantheism of Ammonius Saccas, 113.
Papal power, in 3d cent., 163, 164, n.; in 4th, 163, &c., 235, &c., 284, n. (5); in 5th, 322, &c., 326, n. (11), (14); in 6th, 389; in 7th, 437.
Papius, bishop of Hierapolis, 2d cent., 123, 126.
Paphnutius, monk of Egypt, 4th cent., 249, n., 295.
Paraclete of Montanus, &c., 151, n. (29), 192, 195.
Paschasius of Rome., 6th cent., 404.
Paterius, commentator, 7th cent., 413, 446.
Patriarchs, origin of, 117, 232, &c., 323, &c.
Patricius, (St. Patrick, Succathus), apostle of Ireland, 5th cent., 316, n. (13).
Patricians, sect, in 2d cent., 149; in 3d, 197, 198, &c.
Patronage, right of, its origin, 4th cent., 277, n. (5).
Paul, the apostle, 46; his martyrdom, 47, n. (8), 48, n., 56, n. (18).
 —, the hermit of Egypt, 3d cent., 179.
 — of Samosata, 3d cent., 200, n. (15), 201, n. (16).
 —, bishop of Emessa, 5th cent., 334.
 —, a Monophysite, 7th cent., 451.
Paulicians, sect, 7th cent., 450.
Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, 4th cent., 271, &c., n. (40).
 — of Nola, 253, n. (37), 337.
Petricordius, a poet, 5th cent., 341.
 —, 1st bishop of York, 7th cent., 423, n.
Peada, king of Mercia, 7th cent., 423, n.
Pelagius, the heretic, 5th cent., 370, &c., n. (45).
 — I., bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 405, 411.
 — II., bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 405.
Pelagians, in 5th cent., 370, &c.; in 6th, 415; in 7th, 450.
Penance, in 1st cent., 82; in 2d, 131; in 4th, 268; in 5th, 351, n. (5); in 7th, 447.
People, rights of, in primitive church, xv., 68, 69; in 2d cent., 116, 117; in 3d, 163, &c.; in 4th, 231, 232.
Perpetua, a martyr, 3d cent., 156.
Persecutions, whether just *ten*, 52; those in 1st cent., 51, &c., 97; in 2d, 105; in 3d, 156-160; in 4th, 208-211, 217, 219, 228, 284, &c., n. (12), 296, 298, &c., 307; in 5th, 313, 318.

- &c., 353, 354; in 6th, 384, 415-417; in 7th, 426.
Persia, persecutions there, 228, 319, 426.
Peter, the apostle. His martyrdom, 47, n. (8), 48, n., 56, n. (18).
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 4th cent., 239, n. (13), 268, &c.
 — *Chrysologus*, bishop of Ravenna, 5th cent., 337, n. (38).
 — *Fullo*, bishop of Antioch, 5th cent., 367, &c.
 — *Moggus*, bishop of Alexandria, 5th cent., 366, 368.
 —, a deacon of Rome, 6th cent., 404.
Petilianus, a Donatist writer, 4th cent., 258.
Phantasiastæ, sect, 6th cent., 418.
Pharisees, Jewish sect, 35, 36.
Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, 4th cent., 255, n. (39), 263.
Philetus, mentioned by St. Paul, 88, n. (3).
Philip, emperor, 3d cent., whether a Christian, 154.
 — of Side, 5th cent., 333, 345.
 —, a friend of Jerome, 5th cent., 340.
Philo, the Jew, 1st cent., 32, 37.
 — of Carpathus, 6th cent., 343.
Philosophy, state of, in 1st cent., 29, 59-65; in 2d, 109, &c.; in 3d, 161, 162; in 4th, 223, 229, &c.; in 5th, 321, &c.; in 6th, 386, &c.; in 7th, 446.
 —, Oriental, 29, 39, 61-64, 90, &c.
 —, its influence on theology, 61, 105, 111, 115, 125, 129, &c., 149, 162, 188, 261.
Philostorgius, ecclesiastical historian, 5th cent., 333, 345.
Philostratus, a philosopher, 3d cent., 160.
Philoxenus or *Xenaias*, bishop of Hierapolis or *Mabug*, 6th cent., 367, 407, 419.
Phocas, emperor, 7th cent., 436, &c., n. (2).
Phœbadius, bishop in France, 4th cent., 257.
Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, 4th cent., 304, &c., n. (58), (59).
Picts, converted, in 4th cent., 380, &c., n. (7).
Pierius of Alexandria, 3d cent., 176, 179.
Pilgrimages, in 4th cent., 259, n. (1); in 5th cent., 343.
Pisides, Gregory or George, 7th cent., 440, n. (20).
Placidus, Benedictine monk, 6th cent., 394.
Plato, and Platonic philosophy, 31, &c.; in 2d cent., 110, &c., 119, &c.; in 3d, 159, &c., 161, &c.; in 4th, 229, &c.; in 5th, 321, &c.; in 6th, 383, 387; in 7th, 436.
Pliny the younger, 105.
Pleroma of the Gnostics, 63, 95, 145.
Plotinus, a philosopher, 3d cent., 161, 162, 191.
Plutarch of Chæroneæ, a philosopher, 2d cent., 110.
 —, a philosopher of 3d cent., 162.
 — *Nestorii*, philosopher, 5th cent., 322.
Pneumatomachi, sect, 4th cent., 300.
Polemic: see *Theology*, polemic.
Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, 2d cent., 77, 107, 136.
Polychronius, bishop of Apamea, 5th cent., 333, 343.
Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, 2d cent., 136, 174, n. (18).
Pomerius, Julianus, 5th cent., 341, 347, 446, 448.
Pontus, deacon of Carthage, 3d cent., 175.
Pontius or *Paulinus* of Nola, 253, n. (37), 337.
Popery: see *Papal* power.
Porphyry, a philosopher, 3d cent., 159, 162, n. (4).
Possidonius or *Pisidius*, 5th cent., 340.
Pothinus, missionary to Gaul, 2d cent., 100.
Potamiena, a martyr, 3d cent., 157.
Potamon, a philosopher, 2d cent., 32.
Praxeas, a confessor and Monarchian, 2d cent., 149, n. (26).
Prayers, hours of, in 3d cent., 190.
Preaching, mode of, in 1st cent., 86; in 3d, 188; in 4th, 278; in 7th, 435.
Predestinarian controversy, 5th cent., 373, &c., n. (52), (53).
Presbyters, 46, 69, 71, 116, 117, 163, 165, 231, 232, 237, 273, n. (43), 327.
Prescription against errors, in 2d cent., 127; in 3d cent., 183, n. (12).
Priesthood, Jewish, imitated, 2d cent., 117, 118, 133.
Primasius of Adrumetum, 6th cent., 401, n. (38), 407, 408.
Priscilla, and *Priscillianists*, 2d cent., 152, n. (30).
Priscillian, and *Priscillianists*, 4th cent., 307, &c., n. (65), (66).
Proba, Anicia Franconia, 4th cent., 258.
Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, 5th cent., 334.
 —, a philosopher, 5th cent., 322, 384, n. (8).
Procopius of Gaza, 5th cent., 395, n. (21), 407.
 — of Cæsarea, historian, 6th cent., 383, n. (2).
Prophets of the New Testament, 69.
Prosper of Aquitain, 5th cent., 337, n. (40), 346, 376, n. (55).
Prudentius, a poet, 4th cent., 256, n. (43).
Psalms of David, used in 4th cent., 278.
Psathyrians, party in 4th cent., 301, n. (45).
Ptolomæus, Gnostic heresiarch, 2d cent., 147.
Purgatory, in 2d cent., 126; in 3d cent., 195; in 4th cent., 259; in 5th, 343; in 6th, 406; in 7th, 445.
Pyrrhus, bishop of Constantinople, 7th cent., 454.
- Q.
- Quadragesimal* or *Lent* fast, 4th cent., 280, n. (13).
Quadratus, bishop of Athens, 2d cent., 106, 123.
Quadrivium, what, 321, n. (4).
Quinisextum consilium, 7th cent., 448, 458.
- R.
- Radbod*, king of Friesland, 7th cent., 425, n. (10).
Recognitions of Clement, 75, 76, n. (29), 184, n. (15).
Relics, venerated, in 4th cent., 260; in 5th, 343; in 6th, 406; in 7th, 445.
Religion, state of, in the world, 21, 34, &c.; among Christians, in 1st cent., 78, &c., 82, n. (8); in 2d, 125, &c.; in 3d, 177, &c.; in 4th, 259, 268; in 5th, 342, &c.; in 6th, 406; in 7th, 445, 447.
Remigius, archbishop of Rheims, 5th cent., 341, 379.
Rheticus, bishop of Autun, 4th cent., 256.
Rhodon, a writer, 2d cent., 124.
Rites: see *Ceremonies*.

- Rogation Sunday*, &c., 351, n. (1).
Rufinus of Aquileia, 4th cent., 254, n. (38), 261, 275.
Ruling Elders, 1st cent., 69.
Ruricius, senior, bishop of Limoges, 5th cent., 341.
Rusticus, deacon at Rome, 6th cent., 405.
- S.
- Sabas*, a Syrian monk, 5th cent., 335, n.
Sabellius of Africa, 3d cent., 198, n. (12).
Sabians: see *Hemerobaptists*.
Sabinus, bishop of Heraclea, 5th cent., 333.
Sacred Classics of Apollinaris, 247, n. (29).
Sadducees, a Jewish sect, 35, 36.
Saints, worshipped, in 5th cent., 342, &c.; in 6th, 390, 406, 414; in 7th, 415.
Salonius, bishop of Lyons, 5th cent., 340.
Salvianus, 5th cent., 318, 337, n. (39), 346, 318.
Samaritans, nation of, 34, 40.
Samosateans: see *Paul* of Samosata.
Sapor II., king of Persia, 4th cent., persecutes, 228.
Sarabaites, vagrant monks, 267.
Saracens, their conquests, 7th cent., 431, n. (8*).
Sardica, council, its 4th canon, 236, n. (9).
Saturninus of Antioch, heretic, 140, 141.
Schismus: see *Heresies*, and *Controversies*.
Scholastic theology, its origin, 178, 182, 262; its nature, 408.
Schools, Christian, in 1st cent., 81, n. (5); in 2d, 111; in 3d, 162, 177; in 4th, 219, 230; in 5th, 320, &c.; in 6th, 385, 387; in 7th, 435.
Science: see *Learning*.
Scotland, state of, in 3d cent., 156; in 6th, 381, n. (7).
Scriptures, how regarded, in 1st cent., 79; in 2d, 126; in 4th, 261.
Sects: see *Heresies*.
Secundians, Gnostic sect, 2d cent., 147.
Sedulius, a Scotch poet, 5th cent., 340.
Semiarrians, in 4th cent., 300, &c.
Semipelagians, in 5th cent., 375, &c.; in 6th, 415; in 7th, 450.
Septuagint, how regarded, in 2d cent., 126; in 4th cent., 261.
Serapion, bishop of Antioch, 2d cent., 124.
Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, 4th cent., 248, n.
Sergius, patriarch of Monophysites, 387, &c., 417.
—, bishop of Constantinople, 7th cent., 441, n., 452, 453, n. (9).
Sethites, a sect, in 2d cent., 147, &c.
Sextus, Greek writer, 2d cent., 124, 171, n.
Sverrianus, bishop of Gabala, 5th cent., 333, 346.
Severus, emperor, in 2d cent., 53, 97, 108.
—, Alexander, emperor, 3d cent., 154, 156, 160.
—, Sulpicius, ecclesiastical historian, 4th cent., 255, n. (42).
—, bishop of Minores, 5th cent., 339, n.
—, bishop of Antioch, 6th cent., 397, 407, 417, 418.
Shiites, a Mohammedan sect, 432, 431, n.
Sibylline Oracles, 2d cent., 130, n. (15).
Sidonius, Apollinaris, 5th cent., 338, n. (13).
Sigan, monument of, China, 421, n. (1).
Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, 2d cent., 106.
Simeon Stylites, senior, 5th cent., 313, 347, n. (20).
Simeon Stylites, junior, 6th cent., 398.
Simon Magus, 92-91.
Simplicius, bishop of Rome, 5th cent., 341.
—, a philosopher, 6th cent., 383, n. (7).
Siricius, bishop of Rome, 4th cent., 258.
Sisebutus, Gothic king in Spain, 7th cent., 443.
Sixtus II., bishop of Rome, 3d cent., 159, 175.
— III., bishop of Rome, 5th cent., 340.
Socrates, ecclesiastical historian, 5th cent., 334.
Sonnites, Mohammedan sect, 432, n. (10), (11).
Sophronius, monk of Palestine, 4th cent., 249, n.
—, bishop of Jerusalem, 7th cent., 436, 410, n. (18), 452, &c., n. (9).
Sozomen, ecclesiastical historian, 5th cent., 334.
Spurious Gospels, Acts, Epistles, 73, &c., n. (23).
Stations, among Romanists, what, 414, n. (4).
Stephen I., bishop of Rome, 3d cent., 175, 186.
Stoic philosophy, 31, n. (37), 110.
Stylites, or pillar saints, 5th cent., 347, &c.
Sub-deacons, their office, 165.
Sulpicius Severus, ecclesiastical historian, 4th cent., 255, n. (42).
Sunday, observance of, 85, 134, 135, n. (10), 278.
Superstition, increase of, in 3d cent., 188; in 4th cent., 259, &c.; in 5th, 342; in 6th, 406; in 7th, 439, 445.
Supplications, public, 4th cent., 260.
Sussex, kingdom of, converted, 7th cent., 423, note.
Syagrius, writer, 5th cent., 345.
Symmachus, translator of Old Testament, 3d cent., 174, n.
—, bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 341, 391.
Synagogues, Jewish, 39.
Synesius, bishop in Cyrene, 5th cent., 230, n. (8), 333.
Synod: see *Councils*.
Syrianus, a philosopher, 5th cent., 322.
Syricius, bishop of Barcelona, 7th cent., 444.
- T.
- Tajo* or *Tago*, bishop of Saragossa, 7th cent., 435, 444, 446.
Tatian, and his sect, 2d cent., 107, 124, 142; his harmony of the Gospels, 126, n. (2).
Talaia, John, bishop of Alexandria, 5th cent., 367.
Tartars, enlightened by Nestorians, 7th cent., 421, &c.
Temples, dedicated to saints, 6th cent., 414.
Tertullian, 2d cent., 108, 122, n. (9), 127, 128, 152, 183.
Testament, New, translations of, 101, &c., 155, 407, 446.
Thalassius, a monk, 7th cent., 441, n., 447.
Thomists, a philosopher, 4th cent., 225, n. (52).
Thomastics and *Themistians*, 6th cent., 419, n. (20).
— Chdonimus, 7th cent., 441, n.
Theodoret, or Theodorit, bishop of Cyprus, 5th cent., 330, n. (22), 343, 344, 345, 410, n. (14).
Theodoric, king of Ostrogoths, 5th cent., 312, 391.
Theodorus of Mopsuestia, 4th cent., 331, n. (26), 343, 410, n. (14).

Theodorus Lector, eccles. hist., 6th cent., 397.
 — of Iconium, 6th cent., 398.
 — of Pharan, 7th cent., 441, n.
 — I., bishop of Rome, 7th cent., 443.
 — of Raithu, 7th cent., 420, n. (21), 446.
 — of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, 7th cent., 423, n., 436, 444, 447.
Theodosius the Great, emp., 4th cent., 222, 299.
 — II., emperor, 5th cent., 313, 319, 358, 365.
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 6th cent., 418, 419.
Theodotus of Rome, 2d cent., 149, 150, n. (27).
 — of Ancyra, 5th cent., 332, n. (29).
Theognostus of Alexandria, 3d cent., 176, 182.
Theology, Positive, Scholastic, and Mystic, 407, 408.
 —, exegetic, in 1st cent., 79; in 2d, 126; in 3d, 179, &c.; in 4th, 261; in 5th, 343, &c.; in 6th, 406, &c.; in 7th, 445, &c.
 —, didactic, in 1st cent., 78, &c.; in 2d, 125, 126; in 3d, 177, &c., 182; in 4th, 259, 261, &c.; in 5th, 342, 344; in 6th, 407, &c.; in 7th, 446, &c.
 —, practical, in 1st cent., 78, 80; in 2d, 128; in 3d, 182; in 4th, 263, &c.; in 5th, 346, 348; in 6th, 408; in 7th, 446, &c.
 —, polemic, in 1st cent., 83; in 2d, 127; in 3d, 183, &c.; in 4th, 262, &c.; in 5th, 345; in 6th, 408, &c.; in 7th, 447, &c.
Theonas, bishop in 4th cent., 256.
Theopaschites, sect, 5th cent., 367, 412.
Theophanes of Byzantium, 6th cent., 398, &c.
Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, 2d cent., 120, 121, n. (7), 126.
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 5th cent., 275, &c., 330, n. (24), 349.
 —, bishop of the Goths, 4th cent., 226.
Theophrastus, a philosopher, 5th cent., 322.
Theophylact, Simocatta, 7th cent., 441, n.
Therapeutæ, a Jewish sect, 37, n. (14).
Theurgy, what, 114, n. (19).
Thomas, the apostle, 48, n.; visited India, and some say, China, 422, n. (2).
 — of Heraclea, 7th cent., 446.
Thundering Legion, 2d cent., 103, 104.
Thurificatores, who, 157.
Tiberius, emperor, 1st cent., 49.
Tichonius of Africa, 4th cent., 258, 261.
Timothy, companion of St. Paul, 48, n.
 — III., bishop of Alexandria, 6th cent., 397.
 —, bishop of Constantinople, 6th cent., 397.
 —, a writer of the 7th cent., 448.
Tithes, 118, n. (3), 133.
Tituli, what, 277, n. (4).
Titus, companion of St. Paul, 48, n.
 — of Bostra, in 4th cent., 248, n.
Toleration among pagans, 25, 53.
Traditors, who, 209, 283.
Trajan, emperor, 2d cent., 97, 105, 106.
Tribonianus, a jurist, 6th cent., 382, n. (1).
Trinity, disputes on, in 2d cent., 149, 150; in 3d, 197-200; in 4th, 287, &c.; in 5th, 356, &c.; in 6th, 412, 419, &c.
Triphtilus of Cyprus, 4th cent., 218.
Tritheists, in 6th cent., 419, &c.
Trivium, what, 321, n. (4).
Tryphon, Greek writer, 3d cent., 174, n.
Tychonius or Tichonius, 4th cent., 258, 261.
Typus, edict of emp. Constans, 7th cent., 454.

V.

Valens, emperor, 4th cent., 226, 299.
Valentinian, emperor, 4th cent., 299.
Valentinus, and his sect, 2d cent., 145-147.
Valerian, emperor, 3d cent., 159.
 —, bishop in 5th cent., 340.
Valerius, Spanish monk, 7th cent., 444.
Vandals, when converted, 300, n. (40); persecute in Africa, 5th cent., 354, &c.
Vararanes, king of Persia, 5th cent., 319.
Veda of the Indians, 60, n. (5).
Vernacular liturgies, 6th cent., 413.
Victor I., bishop of Rome, 2d cent., 124, 136.
 — of Antioch, 5th cent., 332, 343.
 — or Victorinus, a poet, 5th cent., 340.
 — Vitenis, 5th cent., 341.
 — of Tununum, 6th cent., 405.
 — of Capua, 6th cent., 405, 407.
Victorinus of Petau, 3d cent., 176, 182, 183.
 — Fabius Marcus, 4th cent., 257.
Victorius or Victorinus of Gaul, 5th cent., 340.
Vigilantius, a reformer, 5th cent., 348, &c.
Vigilius of Tapsus, 5th cent., 338, n. (44).
 —, bishop of Rome, 6th cent., 405, 411.
Vincentius of Lerins, 5th cent., 338, n. (42).
Vitalionus, bishop of Rome, 7th cent., 444, 445.
Vitellius, a Donatist writer, 4th cent., 257.
Ulphilas or Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths, 4th cent., 155, n. (10), 226, n. (63), 300, n. (39).
Uction, extreme, 2d cent., 87.
Vocunius of Africa, 5th cent., 345.
Volusianus, emperor, 3d cent., 158.
Uranus, Nestor. philos., 6th cent., 388, n. (14).
Ursicinus, bishop of Rome, 4th cent., 235.
Vulgate Bible, what, 261, n. (9).

W.

Waldensians, perhaps in 7th cent., 438.
Wessex, kingd. of, converted, 7th cent., 423, n.
Whitby, council of, 7th cent., 423, n.
Wilfrid, bishop of York, 7th cent., 423, n., 437, n. (5).
Willibrord, Engl. miss., 7th cent., 425, n. (10).
World, state of, when Christ came, 23-33.
Worship, public, of Christians, in 1st cent., 84, &c.; in 2d, 134, n. (10); in 3d, 188; in 4th, 260, n. (25), 276, 277, &c.; in 5th, 350, &c.; in 6th, 413, &c.; in 7th, 448.
Writers, Greek and Oriental, in 1st cent., 72, &c.; in 2d, 118, &c.; in 3d, 166, &c.; in 4th, 237, &c.; in 5th, 329, &c.; in 6th, 395, &c.; in 7th, 439, &c.
 —, Latin, in 1st cent., none; in 2d, 122, &c.; in 3d, 172, &c.; in 4th, 248, &c.; in 5th, 335, &c.; in 6th, 399, &c.; in 7th, 441, &c.
Wulfilaicus, eremite of Treves, 5th cent., 348.

X.

Xenaias: see *Philoxenus*.

Z.

Zacharias, eccles. histor., 5th cent., 335, n.
 —, archbishop of Mitylene, 6th cent., 398.
Zachæus, fictitious author, 5th cent., 340.
Zeno, bishop of Verona, 4th cent., 257.
 —, emp., 5th cent.; his Henot., 368, n. (36).
Zosimus, pagan historian, 5th cent., 319, &c., n. (8), 373.
 —, bishop of Rome, 5th cent., 339, n., 373,

[illegible]



SW900.M917 1839 v.1

Institutes of ecclesiastical history

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 6309